

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

East Cleveland Is Responding to
Challenge of Urban Change

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, East Cleveland, a municipality in my 22d Ohio Congressional District, is a good example of what can be accomplished at the local level, with a minimum of Federal help, to meet problems which are being experienced in urban areas all over the Nation.

The story of East Cleveland was vividly pointed out in a recent article by Anthony Ripley which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, April 7, 1968. Believing my colleagues will be interested, I include the article which follows:

EAST CLEVELAND IS RESPONDING TO CHALLENGE
OF URBAN CHANGE

(By Anthony Ripley)

EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO.—This aging suburb of 43,000 crammed into a three-square-mile area has become a testing ground for meeting the challenge of urban change.

Once only a toll stop on the road from Cleveland to Euclid, Ohio, and later the site of John D. Rockefeller's summer home, East Cleveland is undergoing dramatic change.

In 1960, it had a 2.8 percent Negro population. Today the percentage is 38.8. Few white families are moving to East Cleveland.

Ten years ago, 65 per cent of its white residents were retired. Today the figure is only 15 per cent.

With this change have come heavy pressures on city services and conversion of a number of time-worn houses from the settled ways of retirees to the pounding of young, growing families. The shock of this new wave of children extends through the school system.

East Cleveland has not tried to hold back the Negro tide. Instead, suburban officials say they are determined to meet the challenge it presents.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders notes an "unwillingness or inability of local government to respond" to problems brought on by high concentrations of low-income Negro families.

CAPACITY TO RESPOND

East Cleveland has such a high concentration. It also has a capacity to respond: a low tax rate, a city government generally regarded as progressive, a manageable size and a demonstrated sense of urgency.

Its responses thus far read like a list of recommendations for action by the riot commission: City officials have increased services and begun a series of immediate action programs with citizen participation.

The aim is to make the suburb a place where slums will be prevented and both whites and Negroes will be eager to move in.

Dr. John B. Turner, dean of the Department of Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University, was one of the first Negroes to move into a white neighborhood in East Cleveland. He is a member of the five-man city commission.

"It is a fascinating experiment—an important one for all of us," he said.

The raw material for the experiment is a suburb that travelers hardly notice as they

drive east on Euclid Avenue 20 minutes from Cleveland's downtown Public Square. It could be just another anonymous extension of older East Side neighborhoods, with many of the double-decked two-family wooden houses that are almost a Cleveland landmark.

Home prices in the suburb start about \$10,000. That can buy half a two-family house 50 years old on a 35-by-90-foot lot. These are potential slums.

UPPER-INCOME HOMES

Most houses were built between 1900 and 1930, but there is a small subdivision of upper-income homes built since World War II and some huge slate-roofed brick houses built by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. in the nineteen-thirties. Both are near the wooded 180-acre Forest Hill Park, which the Rockefeller family donated to the city. Prices range up to \$75,000.

Several high-rise apartment buildings and garden apartments have risen since the war. They are an attempt to expand the city's tax base, which has only a scattering of industry besides the General Electric Corporation's Nela Park complex, headquarters of its lamp division.

Grant T. Apthorp was finance director in East Cleveland for 40 years when he took over as city manager in 1961. One of his first actions was to announce at a Kiwanis Club meeting that the city was changing racially and services would have to be stepped up immediately.

Since then, street lighting has been modernized and doubled. A housing code enforcement program was started and expanded with an \$825,000 Federal grant. It will include resurfacing almost every street in the city. The pace of sidewalk and curb repair and tree planting has accelerated.

The city's twice-a-week garbage and rubbish pickup was extended to offer free service to all merchants.

But Mr. Apthorp and the city commission agreed more should be done.

Last May they asked Arthur D. Little, Inc., a management concern in Cambridge, Mass., to design a major program with three aims: to maintain a racially integrated city, to improve services and to build community leadership. Both Negro and white leaders asked for the study.

SURVEY OF CITY

The company immediately began a survey, with 250 residents helping sample 25 per cent of the city. Within two months it suggested a number of steps in a 161-page report. Among them were these:

A Community Renewal Program. It is now under way with a \$150,000 Federal grant to examine needs and develop goals and set an action plan for the future. Such studies generally take two years. East Cleveland hopes to have it done in six months.

Urban renewal for a blighted commercial strip. Washington would not fund a \$265,000 survey and planning application that is the first step in Federal urban renewal programs. The city hired architects at \$50,000 to develop an immediate plan.

Neighborhood Workshop Program. Three workshops are operating and paid for by part of the code enforcement grant. Their aim is to involve residents in planning the Community Renewal Program, to handle neighborhood complaints and increase contacts between whites and Negroes at all economic levels. Among topics they study are city health and welfare programs, recreation and job training.

A planning study for better schools. The East Cleveland Board of Education, which is

separate from city government, has an \$18,000 contract with the Little concern for such a study.

On April 13, the suburb is holding Easter egg rolls in the parks as neighborhood mixers. On April 20 it plans a citywide citizens convention, growing out of workshops. On May 26, a citywide open house is planned. Private homes in all price ranges will be open for all to visit.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on March 13, 1968, there were placed in the RECORD, on page 6367, portions of recent statistics prepared by the Federal Power Commission purporting to show the profits of privately owned electric utility companies. In part, this material cast the distinct but quite erroneous impression that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission allows electric companies in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reap unconscionable "overcharges" from their consumers.

An article published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 17, 1968, repeated these accusations. I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed at this point in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGURES FOR 1966 RELEASED: PHILADELPHIA
ELECTRIC OVERBILLS FOR \$13 MILLION

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—Statistics just released by the Federal Power Commission suggest that the Philadelphia Electric Co. overcharged its customers even more in 1966 than the previous year, according to Sen. Lee Metcalf (D., Mont.).

Metcalf, a champion of stricter State and Federal regulation of the privately owned power companies, created a stir last fall when he unveiled Federal data indicating Philadelphia Electric enjoyed an "overcharge" of \$10,548,000 in 1965.

Last week the Montana Senator was back with new data from the Federal Power Commission for the year 1966—showing that Philadelphia Electric reaped \$13,032,000 in operating income over and above the 6 percent rate of return deemed as equitable by many authorities.

The report, which Metcalf entered into the Congressional Record, showed that Philadelphia Electric had operating income of \$65,888,000 in 1966, compared with \$62,858,000 the year before.

He said this represented a rate of return of 7.48 percent for 1966. According to Federal reports here, the allowed rate of return for utilities in Pennsylvania is 5.9 percent, established by the Public Utility Commission in 1960.

Metcalf said Philadelphia Electric was one of 19 utilities whose "overcharges" totaled more than \$10 million in 1966. The leader, by his computations, was Commonwealth Edison of Illinois, with an overcharge of \$42.8 million.

Public Service Electric & Gas of New Jersey ranked fifth from the top with \$15.4 million and a rate of return of 7.27 percent.

Metcalf told the Senate the profits of the power industry were "exorbitant," that they had risen from 7.08 percent in 1962 to 7.44 percent in 1966.

"The ineffectiveness of public utility regulation was recognized in the President's economic report last month," the Senator said. He noted the following reference in the report to the public utilities:

"Although their capital costs per unit of output have undoubtedly risen, their profits have increased at an exceptional rate."

The FPC data cited by Metcalf indicated that seven other utilities operating in Pennsylvania also had operating income well beyond the 6 percent rate.

The companies and the "overcharge" ascribed to each:

Duquesne Light Co., \$9.3 million; Metropolitan Edison, \$3.3 million; Pennsylvania Electric Co., \$4.1 million; Pennsylvania Power Co., \$1.6 million; Pennsylvania Power and Light Co., \$1.6 million; United Gas Improvement Co., \$576,000, and West Penn Power Co., \$6.6 million.

"Overcharges" by New Jersey utilities, in addition to Public Service, included Atlantic City Electric Co., \$2.3 million; Jersey Central Power & Light, \$4.2 million; New Jersey Power & Light, \$764,000, and Rockland Electric, \$184,000.

Metcalf ascribed a \$2.5 million overcharge to the Delmarva Power & Light Co. of Delaware.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the chairman of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, George I. Bloom, has issued a public statement, as a result of the news story, answering these accusations. In his statement, Mr. Bloom expressed his reluctance "to answer similar accusations earlier because it was not the responsibility of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission to defend the utilities." He said:

However, I think it is time for a complete statement—once and for all—in face of the insinuation that the state commission operates ineffectively.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Chairman Bloom's statement be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
CHAIRMAN BLOOM RESPONDS TO SENATOR
METCALF'S STATEMENTS REGARDING ELECTRIC CHARGES

There is absolutely no truth to the latest in a series of unsubstantiated reports making it appear that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission allows the electric companies under its jurisdiction to overcharge their customers.

The newest of these reports appeared in a Philadelphia Inquirer story written by Jerome S. Cahill out of Washington, D.C., on March 17, covering statements made to him by Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, relating to alleged overcharges based on misunderstood Federal Power Commission statistics.

Senator Metcalf is described as saying that eight electric utilities in Pennsylvania overcharged their customers in 1966, with the Philadelphia Electric Company supposedly overbilling some \$13 million that year. He further indicated that this was due to the "ineffectiveness of public utility regulation."

I was reluctant to answer similar accusations earlier because it was not the responsibility of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission to defend the utilities. However,

I think it is time for a complete statement—once and for all—in face of the insinuation that the state commission operates ineffectively.

While it is not my purpose to defend public utilities, as I said, it is my purpose to point out that the Public Utility Commission of Pennsylvania is administering its responsibility in accordance with the law, and the electric companies in the state are not being permitted to collect overcharges as claimed by Senator Metcalf.

The rate of return to the electric utilities is fair and reasonable, and earnings are not excessive despite Senator Metcalf's distorted view based entirely on FPC statistics—not state regulatory commission data.

On the contrary, the state's electric industry has reduced the annual bills of consumers by some \$44 million since 1960. These reductions were made by the cooperative efforts of the industry and the Public Utility Commission as result of continued studies of quarterly reports the companies are required to file.

The overcharge contentions stem chiefly from misinterpretation of the statistics compiled annually by the Federal Power Commission from reports submitted by electric utilities throughout the U.S. It should be noted that FPC, which compiles the data for informational purposes only, has jurisdiction over wholesale rates, not retail rates dealt with by the PUC.

The FPC report for 1966 notes that its review of rates of return is not intended as an evaluation of the reasonableness of any electric utility earnings under applicable state regulatory standards.

FPC's method of calculating rate of return varies widely, and significantly, from methods of evaluation utilized by state regulatory commissions. The methods also differ distinctly from state to state.

Since such sharp distinctions exist between FPC's rate computations and those in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, no accurate conclusions as to rate of return can—or should—be drawn from the federal agency's data without consideration of evaluations used by the respective state or states.

The return to the majority of the power companies—based on the fair-value-of-plant formula prescribed by law in this state—runs slightly below or slightly above six percent. Senator Metcalf, however, came up with a 7.48 per cent return for Philadelphia Electric by following FPC's completely different method of calculation.

At best, the claimed overcharges would have to be based on only the average depreciated original cost of the plant for the year 1966, in line with the basic factor used by FPC. This, of course, ignores entirely the fair return on the fair value of the used and useful utility plant—the basis on which rates are adjudicated by law in this state.

In arriving at fair value, the PUC must consider other measures, such as trended depreciated original cost, depreciated reproduction cost and the cost of capital.

The FPC report points out that no one rate of return is universally applicable, but the allowable rate of return will differ from one company to another and among different jurisdictions. Thus, it appears that Senator Metcalf either did not read this section or chose to ignore it.

Consideration given each company for its cost of capital will vary according to the company's capital structure and its historic and present cost of capital. Therefore, the Pennsylvania PUC makes it clear that the FPC report is not intended to be used for comparison based upon any assumed or fixed rate of return.

It is interesting to note that Senator Metcalf himself said in testimony on July 26, 1967, before the New York State Constitutional Convention's Committee on Economic Development, that perhaps a 7 to 7½ per

cent return could be established by utilities as a proper basis.

He pointed out that the traditional 6 per cent return, reached by regulatory commissions and decisions of state and federal courts in a long line of precedent, is "perhaps inadequate in these present days of developing high interest rates."

In that connection, I call attention to the fact that the Federal Communications Commission recently found the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, in a nationwide rate case, entitled to a 7 to 7½ per cent rate of return on an average net investment (depreciated original cost) rate base.

I would also call to the attention of Senator Metcalf, and other critics of power rates, that the PUC's close scrutiny of electric utility quarterly report earnings is a solid safeguard against excessive returns. It has also been responsible for the multi-million-dollar rate reductions by electric utilities in recent years.

These quarterly reports bring to mind one other glaring misconception growing out of the FPC's statistical report. The news account quoting Metcalf said that, according to federal reports, the allowed rate of return for utilities in Pennsylvania is 5.9 per cent, established by the PUC in 1960.

That return was found after a formal rate case affecting a single company. There simply is no such thing as a fixed rate of return at a fixed time in the past, blanketing all electric utilities. The return of any public utility changes up or down in line with circumstances affecting its particular operating picture at a given time. This is why we make the quarterly report studies.

In view of these misunderstandings, I have asked that the Federal Power Commission consider revisions in the format of its report to make it more readily understandable for accuracy of interpretation. I've also asked it to emphasize the differences in the methods of arriving at rate base and a fair rate of return.

It is my hope that, in the future, any study of the FPC statistics be made in context with applicable rate-making standards of state regulatory commissions. In that regard, I urge anyone contemplating use of the FPC report to call on us for explanation of the Pennsylvania PUC's relation with it to end wholly erroneous, misguided and utterly false impressions.

Your Opinion, Please

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a mail poll of my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Michigan. Over 22,000 persons responded and gave me the benefit of their views of 15 vital issues. I am delighted with this response and encouraged that so many citizens would take the time to make their voices heard in Washington.

I would like to take this opportunity to make the entire membership aware of the results of this survey:

YOUR OPINION, PLEASE

(Second annual questionnaire results, Second District of Michigan, by MARVIN L. ESCH, Member of Congress)

[Results in percent]

1. Realizing that the war raises many complex questions and problems, which of the following general courses of action do you favor in Vietnam?

a. Continue present policy-----	7
b. Immediate withdrawal-----	23
c. Gradual deescalation and gradual withdrawal-----	34
d. Step up military effort-----	31
2. Would you favor neutralization of Southeast Asia by major world powers?	
Yes-----	49
No-----	28
No opinion-----	23
3. Do you favor foreign travel restrictions as a means of lessening our balance of payments deficit?	
Yes-----	30
No-----	63
No opinion-----	7
4. Do you think the Government has done enough to avoid riots in our cities?	
Yes-----	13
No-----	78
No opinion-----	9
5. Should Congress extend financial aid to local law-enforcement agencies for such things as training and equipment?	
Yes-----	53
No-----	38
No opinion-----	9
6. Do you favor legislation to control mail order gun sales?	
Yes-----	70
No-----	26
No opinion-----	4
7. Should Congress adopt stricter penalties for those who deal in illegal drugs?	
Yes-----	83
No-----	12
No opinion-----	5
8. Would you favor an expansion of private industry involvement in programs to train the unemployed for jobs?	
Yes-----	89
No-----	6
No opinion-----	5
9. Should Congress pass a housing program which would encourage home ownership by low income families through private and nonprofit agency participation?	
Yes-----	63
No-----	24
No opinion-----	13
10. Do you favor a national program to provide health services for young children of needy families?	
Yes-----	62
No-----	30
No opinion-----	8
11. Should Congress provide financial aids so that all qualified, needy students could attend college?	
Yes-----	52
No-----	40
No opinion-----	8
12. Do you favor collective bargaining for farmers?	
Yes-----	37
No-----	37
No opinion-----	26
13. Should future farm legislation place greater emphasis on supply and demand rather than Government control?	
Yes-----	77
No-----	9
No opinion-----	14
14. Do you favor an income tax increase as recommended by the President?	
Yes-----	20
No-----	75
No opinion-----	5
15. Do you think the President and the Congress have done an adequate job of es-	

establishing spending priorities in a time of war?

Yes-----	11
No-----	75
No opinion-----	14

Arson in Washington

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I submit for printing in the Extensions of Remarks the articles relating to arson in Washington.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 22, 1968]

ARSONISTS SET THREE OF FIVE BLAZES, OTHERS PROBED: 5 & 10 BURNED OUT, WAREHOUSES AND APARTMENT HIT

(By Woody West)

The District's criminal arson squad and fire officials were investigating five fires in the city yesterday and early today—three of them arson cases and the other two suspected as such.

In a sixth fire, of undetermined origin, early yesterday, three persons were injured when they were forced to leap from upper floors of a 4th Street NW rooming house. One man was hospitalized. The most recent blaze, at 5 o'clock this morning, destroyed a three-story brick building at 2008 14th St. NW, and firemen rescued five persons from apartments on the second and third floors. There apparently were no injuries.

The Federated 5 & 10¢ Store, occupying the ground floor, was burned out. Firemen battled for nearly three hours to bring the blaze under control. The store had been looted during the riots that erupted early this month in the same area.

YOUTHS SEEN FLEEING

District Fire Capt. Robert Gourlay said the fire was definitely arson. He said several youths were seen fleeing from the area shortly before the fire was reported.

City housing inspectors declared the four apartments in the building unsafe for occupancy as firemen were wetting down the ruins. The rear of the building caved in during the fire.

Extensive damage was reported last night when fire engulfed a warehouse at 1321 7th St. NW, another area severely hit during the riots.

Police said the blaze, reported about 9 p.m., was set, apparently at the rear of the building, which houses the Acme Stove Co. and H. Colman & Sons Hardware.

About 20 minutes before the fire was discovered, police said a window had been smashed at a carry-out several doors away.

FURNITURE STORE FIRE

Arson also is suspected in a small fire at 1:20 a.m. today at the Giant Sales Furniture store, 1243 H St. NE. Police said burglars apparently entered the store by cutting a hole in a rear wall of the store and that witnesses saw a car leaving the area at a high speed shortly before the fire.

A fire in a barber shop at 5571 Central Ave. SE, apparently set early this morning to cover a burglary attempt, caused moderate damage when the seats of two barber chairs were silt and the stuffings set afire.

Inez Ballard, the owner, told police that

sometime between 10 p.m. Saturday and 1 a.m. today, when the blaze was discovered, a portable television set, radio, electric clippers and other barber equipment were stolen from the shop. A rear door lock had been forced.

A vacant apartment was burned out, an adjacent carryout and a previously riot-burned liquor store were damaged yesterday in a Northeast fire. The fire marshal's office said the fire was set.

BLAZE SPREADS

The fire spread from the apartment at 1607½ Kenilworth Ave. NE to Georgia's Carryout at 1617 and then to the debris of Kenilworth Liquors at 1615 Kenilworth. Firemen fought the blaze, reported shortly after 2:30 p.m., for more than an hour.

The fire started in the apartment, which suffered major damage, fire officials said.

The fire early yesterday morning at the rooming house at 1722 4th St. NW apparently started in an unoccupied first-floor rear room and quickly spread up a stairwell to the second floor, where several rooms were damaged, and into the basement. It was discovered at about 3:40 a.m.

William Hargrove, 33, was reported in satisfactory condition at the Washington Hospital Center today, suffering from possible hip fractures sustained when he was forced to leap from a second floor window.

Gail Brooks, 18, who also jumped from a second floor window, and Cecelia Woodland, 49, who leaped from a first-floor window, were treated for cuts at the hospital center.

Cause of the blaze is being investigated.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 16, 1968]

STORES MAY BURN AGAIN, BARRY TELLS BAR GROUP

(By John Flalka)

The director of program operations for Pride, Inc., said yesterday that businesses destroyed during the rioting will be burned again if they are rebuilt without giving economic control to the Negro community.

Marion Barry, wearing his green Pride jacket, declared at a luncheon of the Federal Bar Association that it no longer will be "business as usual" for white businessmen in areas such as 14th Street NW.

"These things weren't burned down as a result of a natural disaster like a hurricane," said Barry.

"If they're built back the same way, they are going to be burned again," he added.

RULES FOR ACCEPTANCE

He suggested that white businessmen who want to be accepted in the "black community" should rebuild on a partnership basis, giving control of 51 percent of their business to Negroes.

A portion of the profits from such an operation also would have to be earmarked for the community, such as for providing more recreation facilities, the Pride leader said.

Barry complained that many studies of the Negro community, such as the one by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, were wrong because the Negroes interviewed had "run game" with the people who were studying them.

"That means to tell the white sociologist and white planners what they want to hear and not what we feel," said Barry.

He said the basic cause of urban disorders is not white racism but "economic insecurity in the black community."

The shopping area of 14th Street NW that was heavily damaged during the riots, Barry said, was a place where shoppers could "walk up and down the street and get shoddy goods."

Any urban planning to rebuild the area, he said, should include better stores, and a greater dispersion of liquor stores. "Some

intersections up there have a liquor store on each corner."

NO GUARANTEE

Asked by an attorney whether a businessman who complied with his rules could put a "soul brother" sign on his window, Barry replied:

"I can't guarantee anything because I'm not doing the burning, so I don't know." He added that a business that was community-controlled would be more likely to avoid damage in any future disturbance.

Robert Jackson, legal coordinator of Pride, said about 8 percent of the "dudes" who work for the organization were arrested during the riot.

Most of the arrests occurred, he said, "because they just hadn't heard about the curfew." Pride has about 1,200 youths on its payroll.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 18, 1968]

FOUR FRESH FIRES SET IN DISTRICT; ONE MAN DIES: TWO OTHER BLAZES ERUPT AFTER ARREST IN RIOT-TORN AREA

(By Walter Gold and William Delaney)

Six fires of suspicious origin—four of them listed as arson—erupted yesterday and early today, in riot-scarred areas of the city, claiming at least one life, according to police.

The outbreak of scattered fires followed an afternoon of tension around 14th and U Streets NW, the area where the April 5 riot broke out.

During the arrest of a man on a narcotics charge there, he was cut on the hand, touching of false rumors that he had been beaten to death by police.

The arrest was followed within an hour by a two-alarm fire of "suspicious origin" at an already burned-out clothing store in the neighborhood.

During the night, after District government and civil rights leaders had attempted to calm that situation by securing the arrested man's release on personal bond, five other fires were reported in areas touched by the looting and arson that erupted in the city two weeks ago tonight.

RESTOCKED, REOPENED

The only major pre-dawn fire destroyed the Standard Drug Co. store at 1115 H St. NE., which had restocked and reopened only a week ago after the April 5 looting, causing about \$200,000 damage.

Police recovered the body of one suspected looter from the charred building this morning and were seeking another who they thought they had heard screaming in the flaming store.

The tense situation at 14th and U Streets, followed the arrest of 28-year-old Kenneth Baggage of 2523 14th St. about 12:45 p.m. yesterday on a charge of violation of the Uniform Narcotics Act by possession of illegal drugs.

As police scuffled with Baggage on the sidewalk, he was sprayed in the eye with a chemical pacifier by police and also was struck in the head. Police said it was a bottle thrown from a crowd that hit Baggage, but several witnesses insisted that he had been pistol whipped by the arresting officer. One man in the crowd, James Edwards, was arrested for failure to move on.

FLYERS DISTRIBUTED

Within hours, after firemen arrived about 1:49 p.m., to battle a blaze at the Lincoln Clothing Store in the 1900 block of 14th Street, flyers entitled "Racist Cops Strike Again" were being distributed from the nearby Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee headquarters.

The arson squad today was still investigating the origin of the fire in the vacant clothing store, which had been burned out during the violence more than a week ago.

Groups gathered on the sidewalk to watch the fire and discuss the arrest.

The suspect, meanwhile was taken first to D.C. General Hospital, where he received two stitches in the head, and then to 13th Precinct headquarters.

RETURNED TO SCENE

He was arraigned about 7 p.m. before General Sessions Court Judge Charles W. Halleck and released in \$5,000 personal bond assured by Washington Urban League chief Sterling Tucker, who took Baggage back to 14th and U "so the people could see him."

In the interim, Mayor Walter E. Washington—who had visited the scene of the clothing store fire—held a closed-door meeting at his office with Human Relations Commissioner Ruth Harris Bates and about six witnesses to the arrest.

According to police, black power activist and former SNCC leader Stokely Carmichael talked to the crowd during the afternoon.

A newsman observed SNCC workers cranking out copies of the handbill in their office and later distributing them.

The handbill accused the arresting officer, Pvt. Anthony Segaria, of pistol-whipping Baggage, and said Segaria and his partner, Pvt. William E. Larman, "fired indiscriminately into the crowd" that gathered.

Police spokesmen went on Radio WOL about 5:20 p.m. to deny the charges, and said a thrown object caused Baggage's injury. No shots were fired, police said.

DAMAGE PUT AT \$200,000

The drug store blaze caused damage estimated at \$200,000 and destroyed the building at 1115 H St. NE. The store reopened a week ago today after replacing nearly \$15,000 worth of merchandise looted on April 5 during the rioting.

At daylight, firemen and policemen began probing the shell of the burned-out drug store. At least two policemen told The Star they were certain that one man and possibly two were screaming inside the store as the entire two-story structure was consumed by fire.

Police theorized that the men were would-be looters because officers found that the drug store had been broken into from a rear service door.

Minutes before firemen arrived at 2:42 a.m., one policeman heard a male voice inside yell:

"Let's get out of here, the roof is caving in!"

Police said that they had the building surrounded when they heard the voice but never saw anyone come out. It took more than two hours to bring the fire under control.

TRAFFIC REROUTED

One fireman was injured, not seriously, while fighting the blaze. Traffic on H Street was still being rerouted away from the 1100 block during this morning's rush-hour.

The Washington manager of the drug store chain, Jesse W. Skelly, who set the total loss of his stock at \$100,000 and the loss of the building at an equal amount surveyed the debris and announced:

"I won't spend another damn dime on rebuilding this place."

Standard Drugs, which had six stores in the Washington area before the rioting, lost their entire branch store on 14th Street near Park Road during the outbreak. The family-owned business, based in Richmond, operates numerous stores throughout Virginia.

LITTLE DAMAGE IN ANOTHER

One of the other arson cases during the night caused little damage but aroused the attention of Mayor Washington when he saw fire trucks speeding past his home in the 400 block of T Street NW, he said.

Firemen quickly doused a small blaze in the office of a Save-More gasoline station at 11th and T Streets NW. Fire officials said that two gasoline-filled bottles were thrown into the office shortly after 10 p.m.

The first fire bomb failed to ignite, officials

said. The unidentified Negro man who witnesses saw throw the gas-filled soft drink bottle into the office returned with more gasoline in a wine bottle and threw his second missile, which set the office door on fire. District firemen quickly extinguished that blaze.

As firemen were picking up their hose lines at 10:59 p.m., a blaze of "suspicious origin," possibly set, heavily damaged a grocery store and several upstairs apartments at 2263 12th St. NW, just a few blocks away. The store previously had been looted but not burned, officials said.

MINOR DAMAGE AT RESTAURANT

Another arson case was reported minutes later at 11:05 p.m., when someone threw a bottle of "inflammable liquid" into the R.X. Restaurant at 1426 North Capitol Street, causing minor fire damage.

As firemen were bringing the drug store fire under control around 5 a.m., another blaze was discovered two blocks away in a vacant house in the 800 block of 13th Street NE. Other firemen quickly controlled that blaze, which officials said had been set by an arsonist, in the first floor of the abandoned house.

The burned-out H Street NE drug store was covered by insurance, the firm's manager said. A policeman in the rear of the building discovered that the rear service door had been ripped open.

"There is no question that whoever was trapped inside had broken into the store within the last few minutes before the fire," said Lt. William G. Burchette of the 9th precinct.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 18, 1968]

TWO-HOUR DISTURBANCE: DOPE CASE ARREST STIRS UPROAR AT 14TH AND U STREETS

(By Carl Bernstein and Carl W. Sims)

A narcotics arrest at 14th and U Streets NW, shortly after 12:30 p.m. yesterday resulted in a street-corner confrontation between an angry crowd of Negroes and two white policemen.

Before it all ended two hours later, firemen had fought a two-alarm fire nearby, a spate of wild rumors swept the area, bottles and rocks were thrown at the arresting policemen, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee issued a handbill proclaiming "Racist Cops Strike Again."

Police Lt. John E. Burton, who is investigating for the Police Department, said police Pts. Anthony Segaria and William Larman stopped outside a carryout shop at 1916 14th St. NW, "when they observed a fairly large crowd" assembled there.

Burton said Segaria entered the shop and saw a man "accept some capsules with white powder." Burton denied claims that Segaria followed the man into the shop because he was carrying a television set.

Segaria arrested a man identified as Eugene Baggage, 28, on a charge of possessing narcotics and led him outside, with Baggage still carrying the television set.

As Segaria and Baggage approached the police car, Burton said, Baggage "grabbed the capsules and put them in his mouth . . . The officer grabbed him around the neck to try to keep him from swallowing. Both fell to the street and had quite a struggle."

Both Segaria and Baggage tried to pick up the capsules, while Larman got out of the car to assist Segaria, Burton said.

Rocks and bottles were thrown at the policemen as Segaria and Baggage struggled, police said. Baggage was subdued when chemical spray was shot in his face. The crowd was held back at gunpoint by Larman.

Some time after Baggage had been transported from the scene, some persons began circulating the false rumor that Baggage had been pistol-whipped to the extent that he had been killed.

TREATED FOR CUTS

Baggage, whose home address was given as 2523 14th st. n.w., was treated at D.C. General Hospital for a head cut that police said was caused by a rock or bottle thrown from the crowd. There were no other injuries, police said.

The fire at 1922 14th st. n.w. broke out at 1:05 p.m., 25 minutes after the arrest and struggle. It burned out the interior of a building that had been damaged by fire during the second night of rioting here.

Firemen fighting the blaze were not troubled by the crowd that had witnessed the arrest. The Fire Department called in Lt. Sam Wallace, head of the police arson squad, to investigate.

Stokely Carmichael, black power advocate and former national chairman of SNCC, talked with many of the 250 to 300 persons in the crowd that had gathered outside the carryout shop. Several hours later, a handbill bearing the SNCC label was passed out reporting falsely that police had fired into the crowd. No shots were fired, officials said.

The SNCC handbill asserted that Baggage was arrested because police saw him with a television set. It said that "a white, honky, racist policeman crept up behind a black brother . . . and started to choke him and drag him down the street."

TV NOT INVOLVED

Noting that Baggage was carrying a television set, the handbill said "the cops assumed that every brother who owns any type of equipment such as a television or radio has stolen it."

And, apparently referring to the rocks and bottles thrown at the police, the handbill said that "the brothers and sisters tried to protect the brother."

Police said there was no charge or investigation in connection with the television set, and that Baggage was arrested only in connection with the alleged possession of narcotics.

The arrest and fire scenes were visited later by Mayor Walter E. Washington, who talked with several persons and met later with four of their representatives who were waiting for him when he returned to the District Building.

The Mayor didn't comment on his conversations. The discussion with the persons who visited his office dealt generally with Negro-white tensions in the 14th Street area and with the problems of police-community relations, an aide reported.

BACK AT STATION HOUSE

After receiving two stitches for the head cut at the hospital, Baggage was returned to the 13th Precinct station, where he met Carmichael and Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League. Tucker said he and Carmichael advised Baggage to make no statements to police until he had consulted an attorney.

Carmichael posted \$25 collateral for James Edwards, 41, no address listed, who was charged with disorderly conduct while Baggage was being arrested. Police said Edwards had "failed to move on" and had yelled at the arresting officers.

Baggage appeared before Judge Charles W. Halleck in the Court of General Sessions at 7 o'clock last night and was released in the personal custody of Tucker. The Judge set a \$5000 personal recognizance bond on Baggage, for which the suspect is responsible if he fails to appear for trial. He was identified in court as a waiter.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 19, 1968]

OFFICIALS SUSPECT ARSON IN EIGHT CITY FIRES: THREATS TO STORES CHECKED

(By Alfred E. Lewis)

The city's post-riot uneasiness continued yesterday in the wake of eight fires within a 24-hour period that police and fire officials suspect were set by arsonists.

At police roll calls yesterday afternoon, precinct patrolmen were given lists of stores and offices to receive increased surveillance because owners reported receiving telephoned threats that their firms would be burned.

The police task was aggravated by a spate of unfounded rumors—many picked up by intelligence officers roaming the streets—of impending acts against property at various locations.

Police carefully checked the locations mentioned in the rumors and found all the areas calm. But two policemen were injured in arresting a suspected looter at the fire-damaged Woolworth's store at 3200 14th st. n.w.

Lt. Gerald L. Kline and Sgt. Pat Yowell of the Tenth Precinct were cruising in the alley behind the store about 7:15 p.m., they said, when they saw a man run out with an armful of clothes.

Kline jumped from the scout car and grabbed him. The suspect, according to police, pulled a knife and cut Kline's left arm badly enough that it required 14 stitches at the Washington Hospital Center.

Yowell went to Kline's assistance and was punched and knocked around by the suspect before he and Kline disarmed the man and called for a patrol wagon.

Charged with two counts of assault on a police officer, burglary and carrying a dangerous weapon was Archie Mangum, 25, who gave his address as 1824 Monroe st. n.w.

Kline went on sick leave. Yowell returned to duty after treatment for cuts and bruises.

Although city officials feel the post-riot situation is well in hand, the military late Wednesday moved a battalion (normally about 500 men from Ft. Belvoir—15 miles away from Washington—to Ft. Myer, just across the Potomac River in Arlington.

The Army acted after a crowd of Negroes threw rocks and bottles at two policemen making an arrest at 14th and U streets n.w., Wednesday afternoon.

City officials said yesterday they were aware of the shift from Ft. Belvoir to Ft. Myer by the 403rd Military Police Battalion but were not consulted in the decision to move the troops.

Shortly before 2 p.m. yesterday, fire destroyed a 7th Street clothing store in one of 65 fires in the city between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Fire officials said they respond to about half that many fires in a normal 12-hour period.

The blaze that destroyed the Rodman's Men's Store at 1832 7th st., n.w., was suspected to be the work of arsonists.

In this blaze, and in six others that occurred since 2 p.m. Wednesday, investigators found physical evidence—such as matches, rags and fragments of bottles—that led them to suspect arson. In an eighth fire, policemen said they observed looters in a drug store shortly before it was wracked by flames.

In the 7th Street fire, which took more than two hours to bring under control, an injured fireman was saved by firemen who passed a hose and oxygen mask to him in a room in which he was trapped.

The injured firemen, Pvt. Myer Kans, 27, apparently became separated from a group of firefighters and found himself blocked by rubble on one side and a steel door on the other.

Other firemen found an opening in some steel grating, through which they passed him the equipment while they trained their hoses on the sealed chamber. Finally, heavy equipment was brought to the scene and the steel door was removed.

Kans was to be kept overnight at the Washington Hospital Center, where he was treated for neck burns and smoke inhalation.

Other fires since 2 p.m. Wednesday which the Fire Department and the Metropolitan Police arson squad believe were deliberately set involved:

A store at 1922 14th st. n.w., where a two-

alarm blaze destroyed the building; the Standard Drug Co., 1315 H. st. n.e., which was destroyed; a Howard University stadium storage shed also destroyed; the Sunbright Market, 2263 12th st. n.w., heavily damaged, and a gas station at 1900 11th st. n.w., a restaurant at 1426 North Capitol st. and a vacant house at 808 13th st. n.e., all minor fires that were quickly brought under control.

A ninth fire was reported at about 10:40 p.m. yesterday. Two alarms were sounded for the fire which started on the back porch of 4017 Kansas ave. n.w. It spread through the two-story building and the two adjoining apartment buildings before it was brought under control.

Witnesses told fire marshals that they had seen small children playing with matches around several trash cans shortly before the fire broke out. Fire investigators said no evidence of fire-bombing was found.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 19, 1968]

ONLY ONE NEW ARSON CASE

The District's new post-riot jitters eased considerably last night with only three fires reported and only one of those possibly started on purpose, fire officials said.

The previous 24 hours, there had been five blazes listed as arson.

James Brice, 49, died of smoke inhalation last night in a fire in an unoccupied house at 604 Massachusetts-av n.w., which also seriously injured another man, Waverly Hagans, the Union Mission at 810 Fifth-st. n.w., police s.i.d. Fire Department officials are investigating the cause of the blaze which they said apparently started in a pile of trash in the basement.

Police said a seven-year old boy apparently set an easter basket on fire while playing with matches and started a fire at 9 last night that damaged the rear of three row homes at 4015 4017 and 4019 Kansas-av n.w.

In a fire at 2 p.m. yesterday that police and firemen believe may have been set by an arsonist, Rodman's Men's Store at 1832 Seventh-st n.w., was destroyed. While fighting the blaze, Pvt. Myer Kans, 27, was trapped and slightly burned before he could be rescued.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1968]

ARSON FORCES FAMILY TO MOVE

(By Donald Smith)

"The Lord has been good to us," said Mrs. Annie Taylor, 64, yesterday as she stepped over fire hoses that snaked through the street and watched clouds of yellow smoke rising from the building where she has lived for eight years.

She looked around to make sure her four small great-grandchildren were following. They had been inside Mrs. Taylor's second-floor apartment with a 17-year-old cousin when the fire burst out in the basement of Rodman's Discount Clothing store below.

Buildings on either side of the store had been burned out. Fire officials say the blaze here, at 1828 7th St. NW, was the work of arsonists.

"The Lord has surely been good to us," Mrs. Taylor repeated. "But I'm not going to stay here another day. These fires ain't going to keep hitting around here like that and not get us."

COUSIN SAVES YOUNGSTERS

The children, ages 1 through 5, were carried out of the burning building by their cousin, Garry Michaux. He was watching television when he was warned by the shout outside of a passerby who had sighted the thick smoke.

One fireman was slightly injured when he was trapped behind a steel bar door inside the basement, but was finally rescued.

Pvt. Meyer Kans, 27, was treated for smoke inhalation and minor burns, and released several hours later.

Mrs. Taylor was in the next block at the United House of Prayer for All People, 1721½ 7th St. NW, where she is a cook, when the fire broke out.

The building is in an area that was badly hit by the looting and arson that brought federal troops to the District after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in Memphis on April 4.

DAYS OF TERROR

That Friday night, and the days that followed were filled with terror for Mrs. Taylor, the children, and their parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Turner. Mrs. Turner, who is Mrs. Taylor's granddaughter, and her husband were working when yesterday's fire started.

Despite fires that broke out on either side, their building was spared until late last week, when the store below was set on fire.

Mrs. Taylor decided then to move, but postponed it until she could find other housing. Yesterday's fire made up her mind. She is moving today, she said.

"I have a nice little place out there in Southeast," she said of her new apartment

in the Barry Farms public housing development. "I'll miss living here, but if we stay, we're liable to go to bed and never wake up again."

Representative Henry P. Smith III Announces Results of 1968 Questionnaire

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, I submitted a 9-part questionnaire to every family in the 40th Congressional District of New York. This questionnaire deals with many of the critical domestic and international issues facing the Nation today.

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of the President's conduct of the war in Vietnam?	33.9	62.7	3.4
2. In North Vietnam, do you favor—			
(a) Intensified U.S. air attacks?	55.4	18.7	
(b) A bombing halt?	16.0	31.2	
(c) Maintaining air attacks at the present level?	10.1	24.0	
3. Do you favor U.S. trade with nations that are aiding North Vietnam?	9.7	87.4	2.9
4. Do you support the President's request for a 10-percent surcharge on individual and corporate income taxes?	24.6	73.1	2.3
5. Do you favor the administration's proposed "restrictions on foreign travel" as a means to improve our balance-of-payments situation?	47.2	51.0	1.8
6. Should the Federal Government enact legislation to regulate all mail order sales of firearms?	72.1	26.2	1.7
7. Would you favor "block grant" Federal aid programs, providing lump sums to the States and municipalities for general purposes, e.g., health, leaving it to the States to determine specific projects in which the money will be spent (rather than specific Federal aid projects)?	40.6	54.2	5.2
8. On what level do you think the "war on crime" must be chiefly waged?			
Local	44.1		
State	15.1		
Federal	33.4		
9. Would you favor a Government-guaranteed minimum annual income?	19.1	78.1	2.8

Farmers Want Bargaining Power

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the Farm Journal, a respected conservative agricultural publication, has announced in its May issue the outcome of a survey of 5,000 farmers on bargaining power proposals.

In the subhead of their article entitled "How Farmers Vote To Use Bargaining Power," the Journal editors say:

You'll find some surprises here.

They were speaking for themselves in that comment. They also spoke for me. Although I have been sure that farm support of bargaining power was running high, I was surprised by the size of the majority for bargaining which the magazine reported.

The Journal reports:

1. Nine out of 10 favor new laws to give farmers more power to bargain on their own.
2. 85% believe the farmers should then organize into bargaining associations which will bargain with processors and buyers over prices and other terms.
3. 95% want a fair-play "marketing rights" law—one that will penalize buyers who discriminate against those farmers who join a co-op or bargaining group.
4. 70% want broader market orders that permit organized commodity groups to study the market, set grade standards, inspect, and do research and promotion to expand markets.

5. 68% think that farmers should try to force processors to pay higher prices and sign long-term contracts. (Almost all of the National Farmers Organization voters favor this.)

Because the Farm Journal poll is an extremely significant one, I ask unanimous consent that the report about it and an editorial on the subject be printed in the RECORD.

I do not necessarily agree with all the Farm Journal's comments, but they are thoughtful and significant and merit careful consideration.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FARMERS VOTE TO USE BARGAINING POWER

(NOTE.—Let's go. And let's bargain with as little government interference as possible, say these 5,000 farmers. You'll find some surprises here.)

(By Claude W. Gifford)

It's no longer just a slogan—or an urge to "fight back," born out of farmers' frustrations.

Farmers are ready to get on with the hard choices that are necessary to make bargaining power work.

Here are the highlights from the farm bargaining poll which Farm Journal published in the March issue. These results are based on the 5000 ballots processed by our Research Department at press time (12,479 had been received).

Farm voters want—

1. Nine out of 10 favor new laws to give farmers more power to bargain on their own.
2. 85% believe that farmers should then organize into bargaining associations that

I am pleased and proud to report to date I have received more than 16,000 completed questionnaires. In addition, I received hundreds of letters accompanying the questionnaires in which the people chose to give additional comments and opinions on these issues. This overwhelming response is clear evidence of the sincere interest of 40th District residents in the affairs of their Government.

The many views and opinions I have received from the residents of the 40th District will be of inestimable value to me in deciding which course of action I will pursue in the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of this House will find the results of my questionnaire both interesting and helpful. The following is a percentage breakdown of the final tabulated results of my questionnaire:

will bargain with processors and buyers over prices and other terms.

3. 85% want a fair-play "marketing rights" law—one that will penalize buyers who discriminate against those farmers who join a co-op or bargaining group.

4. 70% want broader market orders that permit organized commodity groups to study the market, set grade standards, inspect, and do research and promotion to expand markets.

5. 68% think that farmers should purposely hold products off the market to try to force processors to pay higher prices and sign long-term contracts (Almost all of the National Farmers Organization voters favor this).

Farm voters don't want—

1. Nearly 8 out of 10 farmers say that when a bargaining group and processors agree on a price, the government should not be permitted to step in and veto the agreement. The government doesn't veto labor contracts between unions and industry, and farmers don't want it done in agriculture, either. At present, the Secretary of Agriculture does have authority to veto agreements reached by cooperatives.

2. 67% do not want farm prices and production set by a government board made up of representatives of farmers, processors and consumers. To do that would treat agriculture as if it were a "public utility" run for the convenience of the public—with a ceiling over all farmers.

3. 67% do not believe that it is right for members of a farm bargaining group to picket other farmers to try to get them to join or withhold their products. They think that should be a voluntary choice to be won by reason, persuasion and demonstrated results.

4. 61% do not want the government to hold elections choosing which farm group processors must bargain with in an area. A

bill setting up such elections is now before the Senate Agriculture Committee.

There are some surprisingly "get tough" bargaining sentiments in the vote.

Nearly half of those who voted are willing to have farm bargaining groups negotiate to have handlers and haulers buy or handle only the products of members who belong to the bargaining group. This would be an exclusive contract, or a "closed shop" type of arrangement. Three out of four NFO members voted for this, compared with 43% of the Farm Bureau voters.

58% agree that when two-thirds of the producers belong to a bargaining group, and these members vote to have processors check off their dues, that the check-off should be made from non-members as well. This is a

"union shop" type of arrangement. Three out of four NFO voters favored this, compared with 56% of the Farm Bureau voters.

55% are ready to make commodity check-offs for research and promotion compulsory with no refunds when two-thirds of the producers vote to do it.

And 52% would agree to have farm commodity groups set allotments and quotas on all producers anytime that two-thirds vote to do it. More Farmers Union members favored this than voters from other farm organizations.

Now for some other differences between farm groups (the tables show the total percent that "agreed strongly" and "agreed slightly" and include one-half of those who were "neutral"):

FARM ORGANIZATION				
[In percent]				
	Farm Bureau	Farmers Union	Grange	NFO
Fair play legislation.....	87	90	88	94
Cooperative selling.....	69	61	69	44
National market orders.....	79	78	83	44
Farm bargaining groups.....	86	89	91	97
Exclusive contracts.....	43	61	54	77
Voluntary checkoffs.....	70	63	59	58
Compulsory checkoffs.....	55	65	65	70
Holding products.....	61	84	70	98
Processor picketing.....	33	55	46	72
Farmer picketing.....	22	35	32	43
Seasonal volume control.....	68	76	74	86
Allotment supply control.....	49	73	61	70
Checkoff of member dues.....	66	73	73	80
Complete producer checkoff.....	56	70	70	76
Favorable legislative climate.....	91	94	91	97
Government certification.....	33	45	41	33
Government arbitration.....	38	54	49	45
Government veto.....	15	29	18	22
Government Marketing Board.....	28	41	36	24

REGION						
	East	Central	South	Southwest	Great Plains	West
Fair play legislation.....	90	87	89	80	85	87
Cooperative selling.....	70	60	59	73	65	61
National market orders.....	83	75	78	74	75	82
Farm bargaining groups.....	92	85	92	85	85	92
Exclusive contracts.....	45	52	53	40	48	47
Voluntary checkoffs.....	61	65	68	68	67	61
Compulsory checkoffs.....	62	58	59	48	54	64
Holding products.....	56	70	80	67	73	71
Processor picketing.....	37	48	50	32	41	39
Farmer picketing.....	26	26	35	22	24	29
Seasonal volume control.....	69	71	72	56	67	75
Allotment supply control.....	44	55	60	49	60	52
Checkoff of member dues.....	71	68	68	64	67	69
Complete producer checkoff.....	65	61	62	53	57	66
Favorable legislative climate.....	96	90	94	89	89	92
Government certification.....	35	32	39	36	34	40
Government arbitration.....	42	44	44	33	42	19
Government veto.....	14	21	19	15	26	12
Government Marketing Board.....	17	29	31	27	37	26

Among farm organizations, NFO voters believe more strongly than other groups in exclusive contracts, check-offs, holding products, and processor picketing. However, the majority of the NFO voters are still opposed to picketing other farmers.

The NFO and Farm Bureau voters are about equally opposed to having the government involved in farm bargaining. Farmers Union voters, while opposed to government intervention, are less strongly opposed than other farm groups.

It might be surprising that larger farmers favor compulsory check-offs for research and promotion, while farmers with less than \$5000 sales are opposed. Small farmers are also less willing to have bargaining groups restrain production.

Small and big farmers are about equally opposed to government intervention in bargaining activities.

Understandably, younger farmers are less likely to want allotment supply control. And they are even more opposed to government intervention than older farmers.

Surprisingly, no crop or livestock commodities are more "red hot" about bargaining than any other. They feel remarkably alike on the 19 farm bargaining choices.

BARGAINING, AS FARMERS WANT IT

We'll wager that many eyebrows are being raised today as people throughout the country read the results of the farm bargaining survey on page 24.

Perhaps they are finding that farmers are far more ready to bargain for prices than they thought. The poll indicates that farmers are willing to make the difficult choices that must be made before bargaining can work.

What the vote says to processors, Congress, Washington bureaucrats and to political candidates is: "You'd better wake up to the groundswell."

If there's one thing clearer than any other, it's the fact that farmers want to call the shots themselves. They are asking for a favorable climate from Congress in which to bargain—but they do not want the heavy hand of government in bargaining itself.

There are major differences between calling on the government and calling in the government. What we read into bargaining, as farmers want it, is this:

1. *Programs would be farmer inspired.* Farmers, working together, would shape the commodity bargaining programs they feel will succeed. They wouldn't need to depend on haphazard programs carved out of politi-

cal compromise by Congress at the tag end of a session.

2. *Plans would be flexible.* If a program that farmers put together fails, they could vote it out and try something new. They wouldn't have to wait until Congress could get around to making a change—or suffer along with a plan that is harming their market, as we have from time to time with some Federal farm programs.

3. *Price and income would come from the market—where it ought to come from.* It's high time that the consuming public passes along to farmers—through the market—a little more of the higher wages and salaries that consumers have achieved through a legislative climate that has permitted them to exercise their power.

Farmers realize that subsidized consumer food prices and direct payments from the Treasury will eventually trap agriculture into becoming a public utility—with farming run politically for the convenience of the public.

4. *Farmers would elect their own commodity representatives to run their programs.* And they could vote them in or out each year, depending on the kind of a job they did. Farmers would participate on committees to bargain, promote, set production goals, determine grades, establish fair trade practices, and the like. Programs wouldn't be run by bureaucrats trying to build kingdoms; or by political hacks who need a job; or by people who are appointed by and serve at the will of the Secretary.

5. *Farmers would decide how much freedom they'd give up for the gain they hope to achieve.* Participation would be "democratically voluntary"—where two-thirds decide such questions as production control. It would not be "politically voluntary"—where the government dumps surpluses to force you into a program, and in doing so keeps a ceiling on farmers' opportunity at the market.

6. *Program choices would be realistic.* Referendums devised by commodity groups would give a real choice of directions. Federal farm referendums are often a joke—you can take controls at 75% of parity, or the same controls at 50% of parity; or you can either vote for a change in a Federal order or lose the entire order.

7. *It would be an exciting, fast-moving affair with commodities vying with each other to see who could hatch the best ideas.* Farm bargaining wouldn't be easy, but it would be invigorating. The accent would be on quality products to win markets.

Commodities, no doubt, would experiment with various kinds of supply manipulation—diverting part of the crop into secondary uses, spreading the marketing over the season adjusting grades to regulate the amount that can go into the primary market, culling, buying up surpluses, negotiating with processors for the amount of contracted acreage, and other such devices not now thought of.

We hope that official Washington will take the cue. Politicians have long despaired that farm programs are nothing but trouble; and they have complained that farmers never "get together." Well, here's a chance to let farmers wrestle with more of their own problems. That's what farmers want—and this poll indicates that they are remarkably together in general direction, regardless of farm organization, commodity, age, income or region.

Public Information in Government Policy

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, former Secretary

of Health, Education, and Welfare, told a Connecticut audience in May 1967:

I do not believe that the Government has the right to hide the facts or misinform. But the best defense against secretive bureaucracy is in vigorous, enterprising reporters working for courageous, responsible newspapers.

Senator RIBICOFF's words are well taken, but the main requirement is in industrious, straightforward Government information officers working for enlightened, public-spirited Government officials.

The subject of public information as it relates to Government policy is a complex one. An excellent discussion of this subject was presented by Mr. Carlton E. Spitzer, former Director of Public Information for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the Public Relations Journal of February 1968. Mr. Spitzer's article was condensed from "The Voice of Government," a book to be published this summer by John Wiley & Sons.

Mr. Spitzer's article follows:

PUBLIC INFORMATION IN GOVERNMENT POLICY
(By Carlton E. Spitzer)

There is a sharp and healthy change underway in the atmosphere of federal information programs. It was not too long ago that a federal information executive could safely instruct his staff that queries from press and public were to be answered only on a "need to know" basis.

Those days are over. We are not living in an era of the people's need to know, if such a restrictive concept was ever valid in the United States; we are living in an era of the people's right to know and desire to know. It is the job of the government information officer to respond to developing trends, anticipate public concern, and provide useful information, always protecting personal privacy and national security but opening all the doors and all the avenues he can and should open.

The press release is still an important element in the dissemination of information, although few write them well. But to limit action to a press release routine is to fall far short of the government's responsibility to itself and all citizens.

The goal should be to stimulate objective reporting, not to increase the volume of hand-outs. Writers, editors, publishers, and producers should be encouraged to visit Washington agencies, regional offices and program sites in urban and rural areas. As Senator Abraham Ribicoff, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare told a Wallingford, Connecticut, audience on May 31, 1967: "I do not believe that the government has the right to hide the facts or misinform. But the best defense against secretive bureaucracy is in vigorous, enterprising reporters working for courageous, responsible newspapers."

Surely, the next best defense is in vigorous, enterprising government information officers working for courageous, responsible public officials.

There is a need for government agencies to work more closely with state and municipalities which carry out federally-sponsored programs. Arguments against providing assistance from Washington have most often been based on the protection of states' rights and local initiatives. Experience shows, however, that federal-state-local cooperative efforts usually result in mutually respecting partnerships and much more accurate information on why some programs succeed and why others fail. With local participation, those who draft or administer federal programs are more acutely aware of state needs

and the problems a city may have in adopting procedures that looked reasonable on Independence Avenue but proved impractical on Main Street, USA.

Information can be the key to how well federal programs are used. Local communities cannot take advantage of benefits they never heard of. Part of the answer, therefore, is to transfer information people from Washington to the regional offices of the major federal departments both permanently and on special assignments so that they can better serve local media and constituent state agencies. Misunderstanding has come mainly from a lack of information and a lack of empathy for the problems of others.

Cooperation on a rational basis—a multi-state basis—does nothing to interfere with a state's prerogatives or a town's response to a federally-sponsored activity. Actually, the presence of information people assures more accurate and helpful reporting locally and in Washington, and provides the kind of frank internal evaluation that makes Washington officials less inbred and more responsive to people's needs.

The presence of skilled information people in the regions also tends to reduce substantially the volume of institutional "facts and figures" releases from Washington. These releases are great for the working statisticians but do little to explain the worth of federally-sponsored (and almost always state-administered) programs in terms of human need and human achievement. A constant exchange of useful information on the local scene is essential.

Support for the public information function in Washington and perspectives about it vary from department to department, depending basically upon the attitudes of the secretary and his top staff. Some cabinet officers have demonstrated a constant concern for their own good press while largely ignoring the fundamental information needs of their agency. Other cabinet officers have been comfortable maintaining a passive posture, discouraging initiative in information activity and reacting to media interest only when pushed. The most effective cabinet officers have stressed quality performance, adequate planning, and participation in policy.

In government as in business, the role of information in planning, strategy and policy depends largely on the support of the boss.

John Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a memorandum to his agency heads and assistant secretaries, also recognized the need to recruit new talent. He stressed the creation of special programs for summer interns and personal visits to colleges and universities to attract outstanding young men and women to government information.

He wrote: "We must be totally interested in our recruiting and training programs because the future is not worth a nickel without them. Effective recruitment of talented people, their training and their development is the responsibility of the program chiefs."

It may be some comfort to the government information man to know that his problems are less than unique. Although each tends to be condescending about the other, the trials of the government information officer are painfully similar to the woes of the public relations director in business. Both feel second-guessed by their colleagues and short-changed on budget. Both appreciate the need for candor and realism to communicate effectively with their audiences and to maintain the respect of the media, and both have found it can be difficult to persuade their peers that candor is the best policy. Nobody wants to be wrong, and things don't always go right in anybody's business, so candor is often sacrificed for the half-truth and issues are sometimes clouded or ignored.

Government public information officers can be as guilty of propagandizing narrow causes and clouding issues as any huckster,

and usually with far more serious consequences. Only the foolish or misguided would participate in such schemes because they are doomed to failure. The whole system of government in America is open and fragmented, and not all of the players in a government agency are on the same side, although they may occupy the same offices.

Leaking information is common, so public information men cannot act simply as creatures of the Congress or spokesmen for the current administration. Their moves and statements are scrutinized and challenged by a skeptical press and private associations of every kind; memorandums and plans are sometimes prematurely reported to Congress and outside groups by employees who may be unfriendly toward the trend of events.

Thus, information officers and their peers had best hold to the truth and remain faithful to the facts of any issue in order to survive. The government is commanded by circumstance to provide information, not propaganda.

Qualified government information people know that facts clearly presented build public trust in the federal government, the only government all Americans share. They also know that empty phrases don't register for long with the press or the public and that ducking around sticky issues is a dangerous and silly game for any government agency to play.

The American people understand that agencies involved in major national problems did not create the problems, but they do hold the agencies responsible for reporting on their actions fully and regularly. The record shows that Americans respond with strength and determination to discouraging news if the news is honestly presented and a course of action is outlined. But the American people, like good newspaper editors, rarely if ever forgive a lie.

A government information officer may have a difficult time applying this philosophy, but he has no right to participate in policy formation affecting the American people if he is unwilling to try.

Public information officers are not simply spokesmen for their own government agency, responsible only to their peers—they are the voice of government itself, responsible first to the people. They have a serious obligation to tell the truth, to present all sides of an issue. Their role is to be objective, not subjective.

Should a public relations man representing a commercial company distort the truth, the company's product sales may decrease, or its relations with the government may suffer, or its foreign investments may be adversely affected—all serious issues to the company, its employees, stockholders and suppliers. Should a government public information man distort the truth, the American people are deprived of information they should have in order for them to make judgments about their government.

The information officer must embrace candor and fight timidity. Government public information, like industry public relations, is often clumsy, reactive and paralyzed by controversy. Controversy may be uncomfortable, but it can be a powerful asset. Sometimes it is the only way to get front-page attention for a positive program, for the media still delight in negative and strife.

If government refuses comment at the moment of crisis and issues a careful statement a week later when other events are commanding headlines, the statement is likely to appear on page 30, not page one (if it appears at all), and government will have lost, perhaps forever, its opportunity for effective rebuttal or explanation. Years later government may find itself refuting allegations reported in the first story, its own belated comment never having registered on the public mind as anything more than a feeble defense.

As one industrial company president cautioned his colleagues a few years ago when faced with an anti-trust allegation: "If we're not guilty, let's say so today. When a man calls you a — — — on Monday you don't wait until Saturday to issue some feeble statement saying that your lawyers haven't yet studied how the man spelled — — —. Either you are one or you aren't, and you better let the public know where you stand when they can read your reply on the front page."

Most company presidents—and government officials—are not inclined to follow this advice. They still hide when trouble strikes and reporters call. As a result, stories that might have appeared only once, stating both sides of the question, are strung out for days, usually with one side, the side willing to talk with the media, making its point time after time in the public mind.

A quick response to a situation is essential for a successful information program. Usually the only way this can be accomplished is to have the information officer participate in all policy discussions and key meetings. When a crisis breaks, there is no need to "fill in" the information officer; he already knows the background and can act. That's his job.

The government information officer should be both a catalyst, showing the way toward constructive collaboration, and an analyst, evaluating and reporting what has been done, what is currently under way, and what is likely to develop. When the information officer fills this role, he automatically and significantly participates in policy formation as he should. His voice at the conference table is equal to all others. His counsel becomes a part of strategy and decisionmaking.

The crisis in our cities—and the awkward and often archaic approaches to meet this crisis—gives ample testimony that we must not only improve communications but streamline and improve our system of government. Meanwhile, the American people must be kept informed. It must be a recognized policy to keep citizens fully informed and candor and realism must be the chief ingredients of this policy in order to dispel public distrust of government and to create the kind of harmony and cooperation our nation must have to survive. Helping to form this policy is the job of government information officers.

Fear of press criticism about the use of public funds for information has been one reason among many that government officials often have been passive about information needs.

But the information lag—the difference between actual progress and what is known about it—is now so formidable and obvious that few editors and congressmen would seriously criticize the executive branch for spending reasonable sums for staff and programs to communicate effectively with the American people.

The Umpirage of Reason

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished president of Columbia University, Dr. Grayson Kirk, delivered an important address on the occasion of the Founder's Day celebration and the 225th birthday of Thomas Jefferson, at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville on April 12, 1968.

Pointing out that American society is in trouble, Dr. Kirk enumerates difficulties and identifies some of the sources of these difficulties. He suggests that fresh

and imaginative thinking unbound to past approaches is needed for the solution of the staggeringly complex problems confronting the American people. Finally, Dr. Kirk recommends priorities in dealing with our troubled conditions.

Although I do not necessarily endorse his views in their entirety, I believe that Dr. Kirk has made an important contribution to the national dialog that deserves serious attention by concerned citizens. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Kirk's remarks be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UMPIRAGE OF REASON

(Partial text of address by President Grayson Kirk of Columbia University on the occasion of a Founder's Day celebration and the 225th birthday of Thomas Jefferson, at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., April 12, 1968)

So much has been written about Thomas Jefferson, and by men who have devoted years to the study of his life and thought, that your speaker today would be presumptuous if he were to attempt on this occasion merely to add another eulogy, or to make another appraisal, of that much-examined life. But there have been a few men who in the course of American history have achieved such towering greatness that their renown has continued to grow through the years, and we would be the poorer if we did not pause from time to time to pay our tribute to them and, in so doing, to draw from their lives renewed courage and, hopefully, greater wisdom as we struggle with the baffling problems of our own day. Such a man was Thomas Jefferson, and today, on the eve of the two hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of his birth, we would be remiss if we did not take the occasion to salute the memory of a man to whom all Americans owe an unpayable debt.

Of all the men of his time whom we would wish to have known personally, I am confident that Jefferson would be overwhelmingly the first choice. This is not because of our respect for his forty years of dedicated service to the public life of our infant nation, but because Jefferson, the man, was so utterly fascinating. Like many of his European contemporaries he epitomized in the astonishing range of his interests the new enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century. His intellectual curiosity was almost boundless. Whether the subject of inquiry was agriculture or architecture, geology or music, literature or politics, geography or history, Jefferson was well-informed. He could talk or write about all these fields with knowledge based on wide and systematic reading, and throughout his long life he always sought to learn even more.

But to this immense range of his intellectual interests he added another dimension that was peculiarly American. This was a constant concern for the practical application of all new discoveries on the rapidly widening horizons of man's thought. He wanted to bring these discoveries to the enrichment and growth of his country. It was for this reason that while the sheer, intellectual exercise of abstract philosophy was of little interest to him, the study of political theory and its practical implementation engrossed his attention throughout his life.

Perhaps it was the touch of Puritanism in his character that was responsible for this concern about practicality. He would not have thought of himself as a Puritan; he might even have denied the allegation, but he was frugal in his personal life, enormously self-disciplined even in early youth, and he displayed no small degree of Puritanism in his profound distaste for the

decadence in morals and politics that he observed in the capitals of Europe.

Equally American was his unswerving faith in democracy, not merely as the best mechanism for solving the ancient problem of reconciling liberty and authority in government, but as a way of life. Given a widespread system of public education and a social and political system that interposed no artificial barriers to the fostering and recognition of talent, he believed that a natural aristocracy of ability was bound to emerge. The men of such a true *aristoi* could be counted on to lead our new nation onward to its destined greatness. His own life had exemplified this principle and he saw no reason to doubt its universal validity.

Still another quality was strongly, if not peculiarly, American. This was his confident trust in the future. Unlike his great antagonist, Hamilton, who was given to periods of deepest melancholy and pessimism, Jefferson was serene in the face of adversity, philosophical about his defeats, and buoyantly optimistic about the future of the society he had helped to build. Thus intellectually fortified, he had an enormous zest for life. He would have relished the words of Alfred de Musset:

"Qu'il est doux d'être au monde, et quel bien que la vie" (Sonnet à Alfred Tattet, 1838)

In the long pageant of American history, no man more richly deserves the affectionate gratitude of the people whom he served so well. In all honesty we can say of Jefferson what another Virginian, Woodrow Wilson, once wrote of Walter Bagehot:

"Occasionally, a man is born into the world whose mission it evidently is to clarify the thought of his generation, and to vivify it; to give it speed where it is slow, vision where it is blind, balance where it is out of poise . . ." (Essay on A Literary Politician.)

Today we are in desperate need of these Jeffersonian qualities in our leaders and in our national life. It is not too much to say that in many ways our society is in a more perilous condition than at any time since the convulsive conflict between the states a century ago. We seem to be in an era of transition from a past which we have abandoned to a future which we are unable as yet to comprehend but whose portents fill us with more dismay than anticipation. We have a multitude of contending counselors but we are unable to place our trust in any of them because we feel, almost viscerally, that they, too, are merely groping without great success to understand the new world about us, and still less do we feel that they have the wisdom to order its affairs to our satisfaction. Our nation is in trouble.

The enumeration of our present difficulties and dangers would ruffle even the calm temperament of a Jefferson. At home, disrespect for law and authority has reached such a level of acceptance that its natural concomitant, resort to violence, has almost achieved respectability. The old social sanctions of the church and family have lost much of their traditional force. Our young people, in disturbing numbers, appear to reject all forms of authority, from whatever source derived, and they have taken refuge in a turbulent and chaotic nihilism whose sole objectives are destructive. I know of no time in our history when the gap between the generations has been wider or more potentially dangerous.

Honesty compels us to admit that we are threatened with a loss of our sense of national unity and with it our sense of direction. Our unity has been imperiled by our racial conflicts for which, despite good-will and honest effort, we can envisage no simple or easy solution available to us in time to avoid the danger of large-scale and continuing social disorder. Less imminently perilous but also damaging to our sense of unity is the generational gap to which I have just referred. Disunity is also being fostered

by the growing incidence of friction in the attempted resolution of disputes between industrial management and organized labor. When even our teachers and our governmental employees feel free to strike in order to try to impose their collective will upon our people, I cannot but feel that all is not well with our society.

Our sense of national direction has become blurred and indistinct because some of the old unifying goals, such as the winning of the West and the creation of a generally affluent society, have been largely achieved; others, such as the encouragement of the spread of our political institutions to other lands, have been abandoned because we have had to accept the fact that they were the product of a time when our enthusiasm exceeded our sophistication. Moreover, our newer announced goals—to eliminate the pockets of poverty remaining in our country, to assure full equality of opportunity for all Americans, and to mount vast efforts against the menace of Communism wherever it arises—these either have failed to kindle our imagination or they have evoked more disunity than agreement. Perhaps we can sum up the situation by saying that we have lost Jefferson's faith in the inevitability of progress and we have not as yet found a new unifying faith for our time.

Our posture abroad offers us little compensating comfort. The image which we have had of ourselves in the world as a highly moral, altruistic, peace-loving and progressive people has never been as widely accepted by other nations as we have believed or hoped. Other nations on occasion have tended to conclude that we have greater power than responsibility and greater impulsiveness than mature judgment. And some of our recent foreign activities, however much they may have been founded in a belief that they were vital to our national interest, have stirred other peoples in the free world into violent and belligerent opposition. So great a power as the United States can scarcely hope for affection from weaker peoples, but we do need to have and to hold their respect for our motives and our goals. At the moment, this house is in disrepair and while the vandalism done to it understandably has been encouraged by those who count themselves as our enemies, it would be an act of folly on our part if we were to ascribe all foreign antagonisms to their machinations.

Some solace, of course, can be derived from the fact that many of our current troubles are being shared in varying degrees by other countries. In many Western European states the family and the church also seem to have lost much of their ancient authority. Youth protest movements erupt from time to time even in authoritarian communist states. One senses in the countries of Western Europe, as here, a general unease, a feeling of drift and uncertainty as social systems lose their traditional rigidity and as political leaders struggle to cope with the bewildering problems of governing an urban, technologically advanced, industrial society.

Thus, in Western Europe, too, the old order is gone; it may not have been in actuality efficient or just, but it was to many people, and in retrospect, a time of power and glory which men remember with nostalgia or read about with yearning. Artzybashev once wrote that there never could have been a golden age in the past because the men of the time would not have been able to recognize it as such, but in many a European country the transition from the days of power to the present has been abrupt and brutal, and men still are stirred in their hearts more by a great cause than by the possession of dishwashers and television sets. There, as here, men need a faith to inspire them and to take them out of the routine of their daily lives, but in most of the democracies there is little such faith today. The goals of our time are too complex, too technical, too lacking in the unifying emo-

tional appeal that gives men a pride in their heritage. Men may respect the political leader who is an able technician, but this is merely an act of sober judgment, and they respond emotionally to the charisma of a Churchill or a John Kennedy with an enthusiasm that no technician can command. Remembering Hitler, this can be a great danger, but it is one from which, despite our sophistication, we are not likely ever to be wholly free.

The unfulfilled need for inspiring leadership may be one source of our troubles today, but there are others, perhaps even more fundamental, which we may not ignore. Today, for example, our problems, urban, industrial and social, are so great in magnitude and so complex in nature that they can be dealt with efficiently only by a greater concentration of governmental authority than our democracy has been constructed to provide or our people are prepared to support. We have always said proudly that though our democracy may be a clumsy form of government, we accept this inefficiency as a reasonable price for the protection of our liberties. But today though we cling to our liberties with appropriate passion we demand from our government a degree of efficiency that our system was designed to make almost impossible. I do not conclude that we should now abandon our liberties in the interest of efficiency; the price would be far too great. But we cannot forever have our cake and eat it too, and we should not be afraid to remember Jefferson's counsel that each generation should be prepared to re-examine its political institutions and to re-shape them as might be necessary in order to meet more adequately the needs of the time.

There is yet another facet to the problem of effective governance in a present-day democracy. This is the influence of the new technology of mass communications. Part of the ancient mystique of leadership has now been eroded by the over-exposure of government officials. Charles de Gaulle, almost alone among Western leaders, has understood this principle and has avoided its pitfalls. By contrast, our leaders are expected to appear almost on call before the television camera, to hold innumerable press conferences, to issue a communique after every official meeting, and to share their thoughts, even if they may be fragmentary and half-formed, with everyone in the country. No leader can long survive such ordeals and emerge from them unscathed.

Moreover, this intense, day-by-day reporting brought nightly into the homes of all America necessarily is fragmentary. It can lead men to fix their attention upon the trees and forget the woods. It can stampede them into hastily and ill-formed conclusions that may not well serve the national interest. I have often wondered, for example, if the British people would have been willing to sustain the effort of the First World War if they had viewed nightly in living color the fantastic slaughter of their sons in the battle of the Somme.

Finally, effectiveness of leadership is complicated by the influence of mass communications in stimulating what is usually called the revolution of rising expectations. Visual reporting of mass violence in one city inevitably has its effect upon men elsewhere who feel that their plight and their needs are like those who have resorted to force to try to effect change. Also, it is becoming increasingly clear that governmental stability in new or weak countries may be in jeopardy for a long time because modern communications have led their peoples to demand more, and at a faster rate, than it is within the power of their governments to provide.

I do not cite these influences of mass communications to condemn them. They are here to stay. I cite them only to illustrate the further complications which they have brought to the problems of modern government. They are instruments of tremendous power in democratic opinion-making. Some-

how, we must learn to use them, and if necessary to control them in such a way as to make them serve the public good as well as the public pleasure.

But the troubles of contemporary society run far beyond the question of leadership in public life and the influence of mass communications upon public opinion and the political process. The plain fact is that we do not know how to solve the new problems that confront our society. They are too new, too complex, too immense in magnitude, and neither our experience nor that of other peoples is of much help to us as we grope for answers.

Take, for example, the problems of our cities. With rare exceptions, American city government has not been one of the more admirable features of our public life. Corruption, inefficiency and graft in local government are parts of our political legacy that we would like to forget. But now, beginning without a strong financial or organizational base, our cities have been swollen by masses of new migrants, beset by racial troubles, bedeviled by impossible budgetary needs, and haunted by the exodus of businesses and middle-class citizens to nearby suburbs. In the absence of new and fresh approaches, some of our cities in time may become almost ungovernable.

Let us look for a moment at one single facet of this problem of the metropolis, the matter of public welfare. The mass migration of largely indigent people to great metropolitan centers has created an administrative and financial nightmare for welfare agencies. In New York City we have today almost twice as many people on relief as during the depths of the depression. We have more dependent children than the entire population of Omaha or Akron. The cost of our city welfare programs now exceeds a billion dollars a year.

No one knows how much of this burden properly should be carried by the city, the state or the Federal Government. No one knows whether dependent mothers of large families, when there is no father present, should be left at home on relief to rear their children or whether it would be better to encourage the mothers to become employed and to provide for the children during work hours in Day Care Centers. No one knows how the vicious cycle of dependency, which threatens to go on generation after generation, can be broken. We do know that the present, improvised system is hopelessly inadequate and that is almost all we know. And yet ours is certainly the most affluent, and perhaps the best educated, society in history.

What I am trying to say is that, despite all our past successes, we have by no means demonstrated that our existing political structure, designed as it was for another day, has the capability to meet these new needs and to solve these new problems. This does not mean that I see any panacea in any of the other ideologies that confront us from abroad. My own ancestors were living nearby in Virginia before Jefferson was born, and I am old-fashioned enough to believe passionately in the importance of America, not only to ourselves, but to the world. What I do mean is that we must not allow our deep commitment to our past to freeze our thinking and to prevent us from dealing imaginatively with the problems of the present. I think Jefferson would be the first to agree to that common-sense proposition.

Among all our grave national concerns, how shall we select those to which we would give first priority? The clamor of the present is so insistent that easy agreement on such a matter is perhaps impossible. Each person will make his own list; hopefully, he will do so with only one criterion, the national welfare. The lists will differ, for that is the way of democratic societies, but the exercise is important. Having said this, obviously I now

have the obligation to indicate my own to you.

First on my list, in timing and importance, is the need for this country to extricate itself as quickly as possible from its current involvement in Vietnam. No other item on the national agenda can be dealt with effectively until this has been done. Not one of our great social, economic or political problems can be made manageable until this conflict can be brought to an end.

This is so because our present policy has produced among our people more bitter dissonance than any issue since the tragic War Between the States. Abroad, it has given a valuable hostage to those who regard themselves as our enemies, and it has obliged us to sustain a serious loss of esteem among those who are our friends.

This is not a time for recrimination. Our policies have been made by sincere, honorable and patriotic men who do not deserve the calumny to which they have been subjected; they have been drawn almost inexorably into a tragic situation. Our national debate should not be based upon personalities but upon an assessment of the situation solely in terms of the present and future welfare and security of our country.

One developing by-product of our involvement is alarming but little-noticed. This is the evil effect which may come from the present tendency, born out of hostility to the war, to elevate civil disobedience into a civic virtue. It is difficult to disagree with the observation made recently by Judge Charles Wyzanski who wrote:

"Every time a law is disobeyed by even a man whose motive is solely ethical, in the sense that it is responsive to a deep moral conviction, there are unfortunate consequences. He himself becomes more prone to disobey laws for which he has no profound repugnance. He sets an example for others who may not have his pure motives, he weakens the fabric of society." (*Atlantic Monthly*, February 1968).

The longer the present controversy continues, the greater will become this peril; it is one that could be around to haunt us long after the occasion which produced it has disappeared.

Nations as well as individuals can make mistakes. No matter how well intentioned an original course may have been, things do not at times turn out as planned. When this occurs, it is often wiser to face the changed situation squarely than to seek vindication through stubborn persistence in a course that appears to offer ever-fewer possibilities of final gains to match the costs involved. Given all the complexities of our present posture in Vietnam, it is my own unhappy conclusion that it is not possible for us to derive from this conflict, no matter how it is finally settled, enough long-range benefit to the security and welfare of our country to justify the effort we have made or may be called upon to make. Therefore, though sadly, because of the fiscal and human costs we have incurred, I am obliged to conclude that a first priority item on our national agenda ought to be an honorable and orderly disentanglement from this well-meant but essentially fruitless effort. The United States will be the greatest power in the world long after Vietnam has been forgotten; it will be a still greater power if it has not suffered the impairment of its own national unity and morale by undue persistence in a course which offers so many hazards and so few compensating rewards.

The second item on my own list is the urgent achievement of greater economic and fiscal stability at home. Our government must be made strong enough to protect its balance of payments, strong enough to halt the vicious, inflationary, wage-price spiral. It must be able to take a firmer hand in resolving equitably the conflict between a powerfully-organized labor force and a naturally resistant management, and it must be

strong enough to resist the natural political impulse to gain popular favor by ever-more lavish spending upon matters that may be only peripheral to our national well-being. A technologically advanced society must be more of a welfare state than the one which Jefferson governed or envisioned, but we are in trouble if we allow our social expenditures to rise at a rate faster than our growth in productivity. Moreover, we weaken the heart and core of our country when we permit people to become unnecessarily dependent upon the largesse of government. Even the Romans found bread and circuses to be useful as a temporary expedient but fatal in the long-run.

As the ground is cleared by progress toward these first two great policy objectives, other items fall into place in proper sequence. The provision of equality of status and opportunity for all Americans must be a perpetual concern of our society. It may never be perfectly achieved, and it may not be achievable in time to prevent us from much trouble, but it is the only goal suitable for a democratic people, and we must bend our best energies toward it.

To make this goal effectively achievable, a fiscally stable government underpinned by a dynamic economy must undertake greater expenditures for the support of research and education. There is little opportunity in an advanced society for the uneducated to find jobs and income enough for the proper support of their families. And it is better in every way for the country to spend money on education, and on the research that will create new jobs, than upon welfare. No man can feel a part of a society when he is dependent for his living upon its charity. In such a situation he becomes abject and inert, or bitter and rebellious, and these are both signs of trouble.

Finally, a fifth goal must be the rationalization of our governmental structure and processes to make them adequate to the needs of our day. We will never draw into career positions in the public service men who are capable of manning the controls of today's society until we are willing to pay them salaries commensurate with what they would gain in ordinary professional life. Only thus can we assure the supply of talent we need; only thus can we have reasonable protection against the danger of corruption and graft. It is a sad commentary upon our shortsightedness that outstanding men, called to high office, can only accept at the price of great personal financial sacrifice; it is equally regrettable that the government today can secure the services of first-quality experts in many fields only by the device of making contracts with non-profit organizations specially created for the purpose.

But able personnel can be easily frustrated in their effectiveness by improper structure and faulty processes. We need today another Hoover Commission to study these matters in the Federal Government, and we need them equally in the states and in our cities. We are trying to operate a complicated and sensitive society with mechanisms devised for the needs of a simpler day. Perhaps I can illustrate this point by the parenthetical observation that the University budget for which I am responsible is ten times as great as the entire Federal budget which Thomas Jefferson took to his Congress for approval. Here again, we should remember the admonitions of Jefferson who foresaw the problem even if he could not foresee the nature of the society that has grown out of matrix he did so much to fashion.

The title for these comments this morning was taken from Jefferson's Third Annual Message to Congress. There he spoke eloquently "of cultivating general friendship, and of bringing collisions of interest to the umpirage of reason rather than of force." In the years ahead we shall have need to remember this counsel. If we fail to heed it and drift further into sterile and divisive

conflict, we shall all be the poorer for it, and we shall not, in the end, be worthy of our heritage.

Special Report Is Made on Law Enforcement Crisis

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, recently, I sent to all news outlets in Oklahoma's Second Congressional District the following special report to be followed by a constituent questionnaire:

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CRISIS

The Second Session of the 90th Congress adjourned for an Easter recess with most members both shaken and deeply concerned by the riots and disorders which have hit scores of our cities—with the loss of many lives and millions of dollars in property damage throughout the country.

Veteran members of the House who served through World War II could not recall having seen the nation's Capital so heavily patrolled by troops during the most trying wartime periods of this century.

Curfews, imposed as early as 4 o'clock on several afternoons, were an unprecedented experience.

Arrests for curfew violations, looting and other law violations during the emergency in Washington were in excess of 5,000. Grade school children and men and women of all ages were involved in the looting.

The Washington Post shattered some false impressions about the looting by reporting that the average looter arrested was 29 years of age and earned approximately \$85 to \$95 a week—which didn't leave much validity to the theory that unemployed teenagers are the major riot problem.

The general Congressional view is that we face a challenge to law and order that is unprecedented in its scope and its danger in this country.

At local, state and federal levels, government must move to strengthen law enforcement and respect for law among our citizens—and every citizen must make it his business to contribute constructively to the effort.

THE FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

At the federal level, it is our job to help state and local law enforcement agencies do the best possible job. Toward that end, the President has requested and the House passed last August the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, to provide federal assistance to the states and cities in planning and carrying out programs to streamline and modernize their police and court systems.

This bill is expected to be approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and reported for action in the Senate at an early date.

Another valuable tool for control of any future violence of the kind we have experienced in recent days is a law making it a federal offense to cross a state line for the purpose of inciting a riot.

The House originally approved this measure in 1966, and again last July. It received the endorsement of the President in his State of the Union message in January and finally won Senate approval last month.

The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act and the Riot Control measure will provide valuable new tools to law enforcement—but the major job remains one of attitudes and improved effort at all levels.

ONE APPROACH

When I was County Attorney in Muskogee, the Chief of Police and Sheriff joined me in

sponsoring a Junior Officers Corps among grade school and junior high school boys.

We had several thousand members of the Corps in Muskogee County, with units in almost every community, and regular meetings were held to discuss law enforcement problems and methods and to develop a positive attitude toward law and order among the boys. Trial Judges, Highway Patrolmen, FBI Agents and other officers joined in the program.

Public spirited theater owners in Muskogee made a monthly Saturday morning movie available to the Corps, and helped the program maintain enthusiasm and interest.

We were convinced the program not only substantially reduced juvenile delinquency, but also helped develop a better attitude among our citizens.

AN OKLAHOMA EFFORT

Our State has been more fortunate than most in the recent wave of riots and disorders, but I don't believe anyone will question the need for work on the problem of general respect for law. Leaders in law enforcement, with whom I visited on this subject last fall, are in general agreement on this point.

In a few days I will mail to every District Attorney, Sheriff and Chief of Police in Northeastern Oklahoma a proposal for a general revival of the Junior Officer Corps program, with information on the successful experience in my home country.

I hope the idea can be used, and will have the support of civic clubs and organizations throughout our area.

The support and cooperation of federal officers will be encouraged, and I feel sure will be extended.

Basically, however, we must win this campaign in the homes, schools, and at the local level, and it must be everybody's business to win it.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION?

1. *Law enforcement.*—Aside from the measures discussed in this report, are there other steps you believe the Congress should take to improve the quality and effectiveness of law enforcement and constructively deal with the national situation?

2. *Federal spending.*—Last year Congress reduced the proposed federal budget by more than \$5 billion. On April 9, the House cut the first appropriation bill—appropriating funds for the Post Office and Treasury Departments—by \$700 million. If you favor further cuts in federal spending, please indicate the areas where you believe the cuts can best be made:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Defense | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Works |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Aid |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Welfare | <input type="checkbox"/> Veterans Benefits |
| <input type="checkbox"/> War on Poverty | <input type="checkbox"/> Research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Space |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education | |

3. *Taxes.*—The House Committee on Ways and Means is considering several measures aimed at deficit reduction and which would increase federal revenue. The best known of these is the President's proposal for a 10% surtax on the federal income tax, which would raise individual income tax payments by 10%.

Do you believe increased revenue is needed? Yes ☐ No ☐

If you believe additional revenue is necessary, do you believe the income tax surtax is the best way to raise this revenue? Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have suggestions on preferable ways to increase federal revenue? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. *Vietnam.*—Several weeks have passed since President Johnson ordered a limited cutback in our bombing of North Vietnam, and at the same time extended a new offer to discuss terms of settlement of the war in

Viet Nam. Prospects for serious negotiations remain somewhat uncertain. With these developments in mind, what do you believe is our best course of action now in Viet Nam?

Note: The questions above involve matters of major concern which are pending before Congress. I would appreciate having your opinion on these issues, and hope you will mail the completed questionnaire to me—either signed or unsigned—at this address.

Editorial in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser Comments on Lowering of Voting Age to 18—Senator Randolph Introduced His First Resolution To Grant Franchise to Citizens 18 and Older in 1942

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, since 1942 when I introduced my first resolution to extend the franchise to our citizens of 18 years and older, the cause has been a continuing one.

During the first session of this Congress, I introduced my eighth joint resolution proposing such an extension of franchise through the process of amending the Constitution of the United States.

Editorial Page Editor Wendell S. Reynolds of the Huntington Advertiser, Huntington, W. Va., wrote a helpful editorial on this voter subject in the April 17 issue of that newspaper. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

LEADERS OF SENATE LAUNCH MOVE TO LOWER VOTING AGE

The proposal of the Wilson Cabinet of Great Britain to lower the age of majority from 21 to 18 may stimulate interest in the movement gaining impetus in this country for fixing the voting age at 18.

The British proposal would give millions of young people the right to marry without parental consent, to make wills and to own and sell property, but not yet the right to vote.

On the other hand, Majority Leader Sen. Mike Mansfield and Minority Leader Sen. Everett M. Dirksen joined a number of other cosponsors the other day in introducing Joint Resolution 8 in the U.S. Senate to give those 18 the right to vote.

The action brought enthusiastic response from Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., who had introduced his first resolution on the subject in 1942 while a member of the House of Representatives.

He also introduced his eighth joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment granting the franchise to all citizens 18 or over.

Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W. Va., asked unanimous consent for holding Sen. Randolph's resolution at the desk for two weeks for additional sponsors.

In discussing the resolution Sen. Randolph inserted in the Congressional Record a number of reports on the advisability of lowering the voting age and presented a number of reasons that had influenced him in his prolonged fight for the amendment.

He cited this "partial list of those respon-

sibilities which our 18-year-old citizens now share with the rest of society:

"They share the burden of fighting our wars.

"They share the burden of paying our taxes.

"They stand responsible in adult, not juvenile, courts of law.

"They stand responsible for the welfare and the lives of their own wives and children.

"They stand responsible for the lives of their fellow citizens traveling on our streets and highways, for we allow them to operate motor vehicles.

"They bear the burden of the future of their families, for we allow them to make wills and to purchase insurance.

"They bear the burden of the financial consequences of their own actions, for we allow them to be sued.

"And they are, finally, responsible for their own ultimate social future, for we allow them to choose their own professions."

Different people will take different views of these reasons and as Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., pointed out in commending Sen. Randolph for his efforts, the 40 senators favoring the resolution do not come even close to the two-thirds necessary for submitting a constitutional amendment.

Possibly the greatest obstacles to the amendment are the high record of accidents by young automobile operators and the erratic conduct of so many extremists on college and university campuses.

Too often those with the least brain power put the most volume into their voices and tend to discredit the much larger number who devote their time to thought and sensible action without exhibitionism.

Undoubtedly most 18-year-olds of today are better educated and have a better understanding of national and world problems than their grandparents did at 21.

To them it seems unjust that they should be deprived of a part in the government until they reach the arbitrary age of 21.

Many older citizens, however, remain doubtful.

Call It by Its Name

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial of April 13, 1968, entitled "Call It by Its Name," by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor, the Tulsa Tribune:

CALL IT BY ITS NAME

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The day after Martin Luther King's murder a young Negro girl skipped gaily past the White House, waving a bright blouse and shouting to the guards: "I stole this. Shoot me! Shoot me!"

The sad fact is that some day soon someone must shoot her, or a system of chaos, terror and economic paralysis will fasten itself on this great and beautiful country.

America cannot operate if any person can loot a store, confident that there will be no reprisal as long as he or she can outrun a middle-aged cop.

Nor can the country operate long under a system of legislative blackmail. When such a normally level-headed citizen as Whitney Young, head of the Urban League, indicates that the country can expect nothing but flames unless Congress passes a packet of additional civil rights legislation this becomes government-by-torch.

When the extremely un-funny Negro

comedian, Dick Gregory, makes out a list of "black-power" demands and asserts that until all are met the Democratic Party may not meet peacefully in Chicago an absolutely basic and fundamental civil right, that of citizens to gather together to choose political candidates is threatened.

Martin Luther King falls before the bullet of a cowardly, hidden sharpshooter. This is an outrage. A young white boy in Tallahassee suffocates after a fire bomb is thrown into his father's store. This is an outrage. A white Pittsburgh steel worker on his way to the mill is dropped by a sniper. This is an outrage. A Negro baby in Chicago dies in its crib as the building burns. This is an outrage.

Americans cannot afford to think about black outrages or white outrages. We must get deep-down mad about outrages—period.

One of the worst features of the wild days following the King assassination was the refusal of many leading politicians to call things by their right names. When Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant erupted in an orgy of looting New York Mayor John Lindsay described these districts as "up tight".

"Up tight" is hippie for "nervous" or "distraught". When the mayor of a great city pretends skylarking gangs who clean out liquor stores and bear off television sets are prostrated with grief he passes beyond credibility. There is a difference between kneeling down to pray and busting in to prey.

This country is on the threshold of a vicious reaction. A double-standard of law in which the people of one race are required to obey laws while the people of another race may ignore them if they choose only works if those doing the ignoring are in the majority.

This was the great evil of the Old South—the repression of Negroes by laws unfairly administered by the majority. It gave rise to the civil rights movement. Civil rights implied a just demand for equal treatment under law.

But the Negro "militants" are re-embracing the unequal treatment theory with the proviso that their own leadership now assume the ancient role of the lynchers and night-riders. Stokely Carmichael's shoot-the-honkies bit is old-fashioned Klansmanism.

This is unspeakable, of course. But, worse, it is suicidal. If America should ever descend into total race warfare there's not the slightest doubt about which side would win. But who wants that kind of America?

This country might take one more "long, hot summer". But not another. If the police and the national guard ever really lost control there would arise informal white armies. Vigilante law is effective—make no mistake about it. It is just not dainty about the difference between the innocent and guilty.

And then—as the heat lightning turned into thunderbolts—a lot of important things would be forgotten.

Most Americans would forget those thousands of Negroes, once barred from white collar employment, who are doing splendidly in responsible jobs. They would forget those young Negro students who are laboring at their books instead of camping in the hallways.

In the fury at the senseless burning, looting and killing it would be easy to forget that the road to justice was unfinished and that many legitimate Negro demands for widened opportunities and improved education had been unfulfilled.

The shooting of Martin Luther King was a grave setback. The idiotic reaction, involving a carnival of irresponsibility, was graver still. We can recover yet—but only if we start calling things by their right names.

Looting is not anguish—it's robbery. The sniper is not a redresser of balances—only a murderer. And to injure a man you never saw because a man of his race injured a man of your race is criminal bigotry.

It's just that simple.

CXIV—643—Part 8

Planned March of the Poor

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I submit for printing in the Extensions of Remarks an article, entitled "Plan for March of Poor Listed," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1968.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN FOR MARCH OF POOR LISTED—ABERNATHY HEDGES ON CAMP-IN SITES

ATLANTA.—A full timetable for marchers coming to Washington for the Poor People's Campaign was announced yesterday by the successor to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

The Rev. Ralph Abernathy, who now heads the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, hedged again on announcing locations where campaigners would "camp-in" in tent and frame dwellings during the demonstration, which starts with an advance party of negotiators in Washington April 29.

A Washington coordinator, Anthony Henry, however said Saturday the campaigners would attempt to use the Mall for their "City of Hope," whether permission is granted or not. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall indicated last week permission would probably not be granted.

THREE-PRONGED MARCH

Abernathy will launch each phase of the three-pronged March to the Nation's Capital—from the South, the Midwest and the Northeast.

Planned by King to pressure the Johnson administration and Congress to take action to help the nation's poor, particularly in Negro ghettos and on tenant farms, the active campaign will begin May 2 at Memphis, Tenn., from the spot at the motel balcony where King was slain by a white sniper April 4. Abernathy will place a memorial plaque on the Lorraine Motel balcony.

King's brother, the Rev. A. D. King, told his congregation at Louisville, Ky., yesterday that "We are going to Washington and disrupt Washington so it cannot function unless it does something about the black folk." If violence comes, he said, it "will come only on the seed of white racism and this is not our fault."

Here is the timetable announced for the campaign:

April 29—Abernathy heads 100-man delegation of Negroes in talks with government officials to present their demands.

May 2—Abernathy lays memorial plaque in concrete of Lorraine Hotel balcony, leads march toward Marks, Miss.

May 4—March arrives in Marks to help local residents prepare mule-drawn wagon train which will wind its way through the South to Washington.

May 6—Second caravan leaves Jackson, Miss., in church buses for stops in Alabama to recruit more demonstrators.

May 7—Wagon train caravan, the main Southern contingent, begins trek to Washington via Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia.

May 8—Chicago caravan leaves for Washington.

May 9—Boston caravan leaves for Washington.

May 12—First caravan reaches Washington.

May 13—Construction of shanty town begins in "prominent place" in Washington.

May 16—Chicago caravan arrives in Washington.

May 17—Boston caravan arrives in Washington.

May 18—Southern caravan reaches Washington.

May 21—Major demonstrations begin.

May 30—Mass march through downtown Washington with all caravans and "thousands" of local Negro residents.

New Jersey Press Support for Monday Holidays

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, support for H.R. 15951, the uniform Monday holiday bill recently reported by the House Judiciary Committee, is mounting with ever-increasing intensity in all sections of the Nation. Before the Easter recess I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several editorials and news articles, taken from various Illinois newspapers and the national press, attesting to the popularity of this legislation. Today I am pleased to include in the RECORD editorials which recently appeared in two New Jersey newspapers, the Asbury Park Evening Press, and the Atlantic City Press. These editorials bear further witness to the support which the uniform Monday holiday bill enjoys. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press, Apr. 11, 1968]

PUTTING SENSE IN HOLIDAYS

The long campaign to put some sense in our national holidays has moved a step nearer realization. The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives has approved bill HR 15951 which calls for the Monday observance of four nationally celebrated holidays. The four holidays are: Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Columbus Day, and Veterans Day, (formerly known as Armistice Day).

These four holidays that presently fall on different days of the week each year would be celebrated as follows: Washington's Birthday would fall on the third Monday in February; Memorial Day on the last Monday in May; Columbus Day on the second Monday in October; and Veterans Day on the fourth Monday in October. Under this system everyone could easily recall the day of the week upon which each of these holidays would fall without frantically searching the calendar.

Bill HR 15951 is a good one. It should pass, and everyone interested in clearing up the confusion surrounding our holidays should see that Senate and House concur in translating this bill into law.

[From the Atlantic City (N.J.) Press, Apr. 8, 1968]

A NEW MONDAY HOLIDAY BILL

Atlantic City's Chamber of Commerce is continuing efforts to persuade New Jersey's congressional delegation to make some of the national holidays regularly fall on Monday.

The purpose is so that resorts and the public alike might count on three-day holidays instead of leaving the incidence of them up to the vagaries of the calendar.

Action of the Chamber is far from an idle gesture, for a new Monday holiday bill

has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee.

This measure, H.R. 15951, introduced by Rep. Robert McClory, R-Ill., calls for observance of Washington's Birthday on the third Monday in February, Memorial Day on the last Monday in May, Columbus Day on the second Monday in October and Veterans Day the fourth Monday in October.

Several similar measures were introduced last year, but got lost in the shuffle of pressing current events.

However, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which has favored a Monday holiday bill for some time past, reports growing sentiment for such a set-up.

Executive Vice President Arch N. Booth of the U.S. Chamber recently extended that body's congratulations to Massachusetts and to Gov. John A. Volpe for becoming the first state to adopt the concept of uniform Monday holidays.

Booth wrote Volpe:

"We salute the Massachusetts Legislature for passing the Monday holiday bill, and you for signing it into law. It is our hope that your trailblazing action will signal the Congress to proceed promptly with federal legislation and, at the same time, encourage other states to start planning their moves toward Monday holiday observances.

"When this bill goes into effect in 1969, I am sure the people of Massachusetts will see clearly how practical and advantageous it is to celebrate the holidays on Monday. Both employees and employers will benefit, in more ways than one."

Massachusetts provides three Monday holidays—Washington's Day in February, Patriot's Day in April and Memorial Day in May.

The trouble with a state holiday bill, for a state that draws tourist trade from other states, like New Jersey, is that unless a number of other states also set up a Monday holiday system, resorts would not benefit much by the change.

Massachusetts, however, also attracts a lot of tourists, and probably felt some benefits would result, other than longer holidays for residents of the state.

If there is a long delay in getting a bill through Congress there is an alternative—a coalition of states passing identical Monday holiday laws. Even if only Pennsylvania and New York joined New Jersey in such a plan, it should prove mutually beneficial.

There is also precedent—Daylight Saving Time used to vary in opening and closing dates with a bloc of tourist states joining in a longer season.

Any Monday holiday plan will no doubt face the usual opposition from traditionalists—but where could you find more tradition than in Massachusetts?

Clarence Mitchell—Prime Mover

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 18, 1968, a significant meeting was held in the hearing room of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Present were a bipartisan group of Senators, who were sponsors and supporters of the then pending civil rights bill, and representatives of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. It was my privilege to attend that meeting, the purpose of which was to consider alternative strategies to achieve Senate approval of the bill. I should add, parenthetically,

that the bill at that point was a worker-protection bill only.

One of the representatives of the Leadership Conference who was present at that meeting was my good friend of long standing, Clarence Mitchell, the able and effective director of the Washington Bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It was Clarence Mitchell who earnestly and eloquently urged upon us the need of adding a fair housing section to the bill. Clarence cogently expressed his conviction that cloture could be attained in due time on a bill that included provisions for fair housing. He was right.

Mr. President, I am delighted that the Washington Post, in an editorial published on Easter Sunday, April 14, has paid a well-deserved tribute to Clarence Mitchell for his major role in bringing about the enactment of the civil rights bill. I heartily second the Post's kudos and ask unanimous consent that its editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIME MOVER

The real heroes of legislative battles are often unseen and unsung. Too often the kudos and hurrahs go to those who are most visible, while the prime movers go unpraised. A special salute is in order, we think, to Clarence Mitchell for the part he played in bringing the latest civil rights bill to enactment—and for the part he has played in the adoption of every civil rights measure for more than a decade past. Clarence Mitchell is the director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP and the chief lobbyist for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. It was he who persisted, when others faltered, in conviction that a full-scale civil rights bill with a bona fide open housing provision could be enacted in this session of Congress. It was he whose faith in Congress and the American people steadfastly thwarted and denied failure. All Americans are in debt to him.

Welfare Pension Plan Legislation

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 one of our outstanding labor leaders presented a provocative statement on the need for more effective fiduciary standards relative to private welfare and pension plans. Mr. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, testified before the General Subcommittee on Labor regarding the increased importance of these private plans in that a larger percentage of negotiated wages constitute the employer's and employee's contributions to welfare and pension funds. Mr. Abel also pointed out the inadequacies of too many plans where employees lose their vested interests because they have transferred from one job to another.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this need for congressional action in a very important area of our economy.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF I. W. ABEL, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, BEFORE THE GENERAL LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON H.R. 5741 AND H.R. 6498, THE PROPOSED WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN PROTECTION ACT OF 1967, APRIL 10, 1968

Mr. Chairman, I first wish to express my appreciation for being able to appear before you on behalf of the proposals embodied in identical bills, H.R. 6498 and H.R. 5741, introduced by you and Chairman Perkins, for a "Welfare and Pension Plan Protection Act."

I appear on behalf of over one million members of the United Steelworkers of America who have a vital interest in these proposals. The bills would establish new safeguards to assure receipt, by those entitled, of the benefits due them under welfare and pension plans. Any measure which would help to assure, without crippling qualifications and conditions, that pension, insurance and other welfare plans pay the benefits called for to the persons entitled would be welcomed by the Steelworkers Union. Such legislation would be a boon, of course, for the members of my Union and the millions of workers represented by other unions. In addition, it would be perhaps an even greater boon for the millions of unorganized workers of the land who are covered by unilateral employer plans and do not have unions to protect their interests under such plans.

The specific provisions of the bills before you have been discussed with the Subcommittee by Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, Director, Department of Legislation of the AFL-CIO, in the light of the policy directive adopted by the AFL-CIO at its convention last December. It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee of the AFL-CIO Executive Council which developed this policy. The convention resolution enunciating the AFL-CIO policy was filed with the Committee by Mr. Biemiller. The union I represent wishes to be recorded as associating itself with the AFL-CIO policy and with Mr. Biemiller's statement.

There is no need for me to restate the points made by Mr. Biemiller. Instead I should like to review briefly some of our Union's pertinent experience in this field and to point out to you some problems which we have encountered. We believe these problems are sufficiently serious to require legislative action of the sort proposed by the Dent and Perkins bills and by other significant proposals which are pending before this Congress.

STEELWORKERS' PLANS

The United Steelworkers of America has been active in negotiating social insurance benefits for its members for 20 years. In all, the Union has been instrumental in the establishment of about 2500 insurance plans, 1500 pension plans, 500 supplemental unemployment benefit plans and 350 extended vacation plans. These plans have disbursed perhaps \$2.5 billions in benefits to our members. And reserves accumulated run to even larger amounts. Our efforts to provide security for our members while unemployed, during sickness and after retirement have been rewarded by a large measure of success. And that success is not suddenly to come to an end.

The collective bargaining contracts, including pension, insurance and other benefit plan agreements entered into by the Steelworkers, are with individual companies. Sometimes there may be several contracts with a single company, each covering a plant or some other subdivision of the company. We also have a few pooled pension plans covering the employees of several employers.

In our District 29, running from Toledo up to the Soo, we have a pooled pension

plan in which over 20 small employers participate. There is a separate pension agreement with each of these employers, none of whom has any connection with any other. They are not members of an association or group for bargaining purposes; the only tie between them is that all have contracts with our Union. Pensions are portable between these employers. But, as far as we know, no employee of any one of these 20-odd employers has ever been employed by another. Moreover, in addition to these differences from the usual multi-employer plan, the employees of each employer have a potentially severable interest in the pooled fund. In contrast, therefore, to multi-employer plans generally, our pension plans covering more than one employer have the same problems as single employer plans, and the same need for the same kinds of safeguards as the typical single employer plan.

PROBLEMS UNDER STEELWORKERS' PLANS

In our efforts to provide, through collective bargaining, pensions, insurance and other benefits for our members we have run into serious problems. First of all, in the past dozen years production and maintenance worker employment in the basic steel industry has fallen by about 10 percent in spite of a substantial increase in production. The retirements on pension were much less than the decline in employment. And the places where old employees retire are not necessarily the points at which there are unemployed members. As a result, we have had thousands of members losing their jobs after a substantial period of employment, with all rights accumulated towards a pension forfeited.

We have attempted to avoid the worst cases. Under most of our agreements any employee whose job disappears because of lack of work or technological displacement and who is 38 years old and has 13 years of continuous service has the right to a pension based on his service to the company, payable when he reaches age 65. Further, older employees with long service may receive an immediate pension (with a make-up to compensate for the later beginning of Social Security) under these circumstances. If service is 30 years or longer, an employee may retire on a regular pension irrespective of his age.

Vesting

These contractual provisions have been most beneficial to our members. But they do not go far enough: 40 years is too old; 15 years is too long. No age should be specified for vesting, and the service required, measured at the time of termination of employment rights, should not exceed 10 years. And termination of employment for any reason should activate the vested right.

We recognize that inclusion of a right in a contract is not enough. Funds to implement the right are needed. In this we have not always been as successful as in the contract language establishing the right; employees do not, unfortunately, in every instance collect the full value of the contractual commitment.

This is an area in which legislation is badly needed. And the original legislation should contain the ultimate objective, even if full achievement is staged gradually. There should be a clear and unmistakable legislative definition of the goal, and of the means to assure payment of earned benefits.

Despite the accumulation of pension funds, at least on paper, there are substantial problems in securing adequate monies and responsible management under many plans. In some cases, after negotiating satisfactory provisions, we find the companies blithely disregarding their commitments as illustrated below:

(a) In one company with some 1300 employees there has been a failure to meet, by almost \$1,000,000, the costs as calculated by the company's actuary. While the pension

fund has assets sufficient to meet its obligations for several years—if operations continue, 8 or 10 years from now the situation could be bleak for plan beneficiaries. After much delay we were able to secure from the employer a commitment to make good the deficit—by 1973. But before payment under the commitment was to begin, and not covered by it, a new deficit of \$124,000 was incurred. Mr. Chairman, we do not believe the bills before you would rectify such a contingency.

(b) In another case a company with between 200 and 300 employees has an obligation to pay a certain number of cents per hour into a pension fund. The president cheerfully admits failure to pay what is called for by our agreement. He is quite willing to increase his current commitment by an amount sufficient to liquidate his deficiency in a relatively short time—and promptly defaults on his new obligation. When pressed by our representatives to make good, he threatens to close his plant by means which promptly communicate his threat to our members in his employ. They are alarmed and the company's obligations remain unsatisfied. The bills would not rectify this situation.

(c) In still another case a company has invested all of its pension fund, except a small cash balance, in its own common stock. Its unrealized profit on that stock is almost as much as the original cost—a happy development not unconnected with the fact that the pension fund's holdings constitute about 10 per cent of the outstanding common. If circumstances should require disposition of a fraction of these holdings, the apparent value of the fund's assets probably would suffer severe deflation. The company recently agreed to take steps to correct this dangerous investment policy, but it will take many years. Section 14 of your bill, Mr. Chairman, would prevent accumulations of such unsound portfolios.

(d) Then there is the Pittsburgh company bought out by one of the great buyers and sellers of subsidiaries. Our pension agreement with this company was implemented by a pension fund of which the Mellon Bank was trustee. The new owners of the company promptly removed Mellon as trustee and substituted some officers, former officers and another individual closely connected with the parent corporation. The new trustees immediately sold the high-grade securities in which Mellon had invested the fund assets and brought very high-yield notes which appear to our inexperienced eyes as highly speculative. The high yield on these securities, so long as paid or accrued, reduces the actuarially determined pension contribution requirements, so that on paper the transaction has improved the company's profit position.

We were able a few years ago to secure a commitment from the company to cover the contingency that the subsidiary might be sold or scrapped—the usual fate of the small companies swallowed by this particular giant. Under the commitment the company would be required to pay into the pension fund in a single sum any excess of book values of pension fund assets over their values as appraised by the First of Boston Corporation. But this agreement expired several months ago and the company refused to renew it. If we wind up with a fund consisting largely of these high-yield marginal securities, the ultimate pension prospects for our members may be in jeopardy.

It appears, Mr. Chairman, that your bill would place directly needed curbs on such abuse of elementary obligations of fiduciaries.

(e) There are ways in which a pension fund can be lost to a particular group, which no bill proposed thus far would prevent. Over 15 years ago we entered into a pension agreement with a company having some 3000 employees. The company accumulated a sub-

stantial pension fund to implement our agreement. Then it was purchased by a much larger company and the pension fund was absorbed into that of the parent company. After a few years the purchasing company was required, following anti-trust proceedings, to divest itself of the smaller company. In doing so, however, it returned only a portion of the pension fund. Neither the anti-trust action nor the process of disengagement of facilities and assets reached to the pension fund: the purchasing company kept a substantial portion of the pension fund which should have been returned. Thus, the employee's pension rights are not as well protected as they were.

In this era of mergers, consolidations, and trades of companies, more thought needs to be given to the protection of the rights of the employees and the benefit funds in which they have invested their wages and their lives.

CONTRACTUAL GUARANTEES

When we entered upon our first major pension agreement, with Bethlehem Steel in 1949, we secured a commitment on a minimum funding standard for the pension trust. It was not an adequate standard, but many of the other basic steel companies refused to follow that lead. The largest of all—the United States Steel Corporation—insisted that it would not be limited in any way whatever in determining whether it would fund pension liabilities at a high level or low level or not at all. And our agreement leaves all decision-making on finances to the unilateral action of the corporation.

However, we obtained contractual provisions with these companies whereby they guaranteed payment of pension benefits under the plans. These guarantees had the backing of the assets of these companies.

In light of this guarantee we had confidence that the great steel corporations would adopt adequate pension funding programs. For the most part, they have. But there are today among the top companies of the industry some which have pension fund assets which are even less than the liability for pensioners who are currently in receipt of pensions. And at least one of these companies is, according to the financial press, not free from the danger of insolvency. While the solvency of the fund is not in question, the gyrations in United States Steel contributions to the pension fund from which our members will be paid their benefits suggest that the stability of that fund is not necessarily the controlling criterion of size of contributions.

REQUIRED REMEDIES

The condition which I have described require a variety of remedies; some are provided for in the bills before this Subcommittee, but other very important ones are not covered by such bills.

Funding

I do not believe that the duty of policing the adequacy of the financing of pension plans should devolve exclusively on a union under any pension agreement negotiated by it. There should be legally set minima binding on employers. Unions may wish to go beyond those minima under certain circumstances and be successful in incorporating higher standards in pension agreements. Where this is done those standards should be legally binding on the employer as the lower statutory standards, and enforceable in the same way.

Fiduciary responsibility

Further, we suggest that those in control of a company having a pension plan be declared by statute to have a fiduciary relationship to the pension plan. Willful failure without good cause to comply with the financial obligations of the pension agreement should be specifically declared a violation of trust for which liabilities attach, as prescribed in the proposed bills.

We endorse those proposals to raise the

standards of conduct applicable to persons who manage the pension funds. Inclusion of such standards in a federal statute should be of great help in elimination of some of the unfortunate practices which I have cited.

Enforcement

I would suggest that the right to enforce statutory standards under the proposed legislation should be vested not only in the Secretary of Labor or in beneficiaries and participants under a plan, but also in the labor union which is a party to a pension agreement. Under our labor relations statutes, a union enters into an agreement as the exclusive bargaining representative of all employees in the bargaining unit, whether or not they are members of the union. Moreover, the union is exclusively responsible for enforcing the rights of the employees under the agreement. Clearly, the union is particularly qualified to enforce and implement statutory standards designed to protect and supplement rights created by the agreement negotiated by the union.

Preferred bankruptcy claim

As noted above, under a number of pension agreements negotiated by the United Steelworkers, the company assumes obligations as guarantor of pensions apart from any contributions which it makes into a pension fund. In case of insolvency this guaranty may not be of much benefit to participants because pension obligations do not have adequate preferred status under bankruptcy laws.

Where a company commits itself in a pension agreement with a trade union to make certain contributions to a pension fund, and where it is mutually agreed that the payment of such contributions is the sole obligation of the employer, there is, of course, no additional company guarantee. But in the absence of a specific limitation on the employer's obligation, any excess of liability over pension fund assets for accrued pension rights of employees, should be given a status in any bankruptcy proceedings second only to unpaid wages. Such preferred status should specifically be extended to the value of deferred vested pensions on which, when bankruptcy proceedings are instituted, payments are not yet due. Where the assets of the bankrupt firm are sufficient to provide all or part of the vested deferred annuities, the method of preserving such assets for that purpose should be spelled out.

Reports

The annual reports to the Labor Department should carry the amount of the annual contribution recommended by the actuary for the plan for the year reported on; the actuary should be required to certify that the contribution recommended has been determined by generally accepted actuarial practices; there should be a comparison on an identical basis between the amounts of liabilities and costs in each pair of consecutive valuations so that the adequacy of the contribution can be judged; and whether the contribution was paid in cash, securities, IOU or other form should be recorded.

Under the existing Department of Labor practice an employer may make a consolidated report for all of its pension funds. The plan operated pursuant to our agreement with the company may be one or two or one of a dozen in the same company. In a consolidated report we cannot determine compliance with our own agreement or the condition of the fund in which we have a vital interest. The rules should require separate reports on each separate plan. Where a plan covers employees represented by a union as well as other employees of the company, the report should provide sufficient detail to enable the union to determine the pension cost and other relevant experience relating to its members.

REINSURANCE, FUNDING, AND GUARANTEES

Our organization has experienced a number of pension plan discontinuances in which, because an employer's liability was limited to his contributions to the pension fund or because his assets were inadequate, employees or former employees who had satisfied the requirements for an immediate or deferred pension received only a part or none of their vested benefits. We have even had some situations in which the pensions of pensioners already on the rolls had to be cut.

These situations have occurred not only in single-plant companies, but also in subsidiaries of large companies and in single plants of multi-plant companies. The fact that the parent company or other plants of the same company continue in operation has not provided any protection in these cases because the contract related only to the single plant which was discontinued.

The reinsurance of pension obligations against the contingency of discontinuance of the pension plan is a highly desirable objective.

We are strongly in favor of such a measure. Its desirability should not, however, lead us to overlook the extremely complex elements which enter into this problem and the conditions which would be required for successful and equitable reinsurance.

In the first place, it is our view that reinsurance must be based upon and supported by an adequate statutory funding requirement. In addition, the legislation should not limit the employer's obligation to the pension fund assets plus his reinsurance premium.

It seems to us that in the discussion of pension financing, insufficient attention has been paid to the advisability of making the company's general assets a pledge for the security of pensions. The "Cabinet Committee" report, for example, termed the proposal to have employers guarantee the full payment of all vested rights in the event of plan termination as a "far-reaching change in the character of the employer's legal obligation . . ." Yet this is the obligation which is specifically assumed by all our major basic steel employers whose pension agreements with us provide that: "Any pension properly payable pursuant to this Agreement shall continue to be payable, notwithstanding the termination or expiration of this Agreement."

Moreover, our experience has been that many smaller employers are willing to give such a guarantee under our pension agreements in preference to a funding commitment. Reliance upon the assets of a small company, however, may be unwise, and in such cases our policy is to include in the contract a requirement for the accumulation of a pension fund.

It is recognized that to require a company to guarantee immediately any increase in benefits to employees who have completed or will shortly complete eligibility for a pension might seriously deter many companies from improving pension benefits. Our large employers in basic steel, can, aluminum and fabrication have not been averse to assuming such a guarantee, even when benefit levels were almost doubled in 1965. With the smaller companies, on the other hand, the Union has often found it necessary to provide for regular funding, with a limitation of the company's liability to the monies in the fund.

However, there is no reason why the two financing measures cannot be used together—a gradually increasing guarantee by the company of vested rights which is supported by a fund increasing at a specified rate. In this way, the liability for vested benefits will gradually be covered by the assets of the pension fund and the company's residual liability under its guarantee will be correspondingly decreased.

We believe that a reasonable and flexible combination of these two financing measures should be required by statute. In order to insure against the possibility that these two financing arrangements might be inadequate to cover all accrued liabilities, a reinsurance arrangement should be established, with appropriate provisions to protect the integrity and solvency of the reinsurance fund.

It has been suggested that full funding be defined as adequacy of the fund to meet the liability for pensions to all employees and former employees entitled to an immediate or deferred benefit under the terms of the plan. Under this definition, the potential rights of employees who have not yet completed requirements for a deferred pension are disregarded. This approach represents a step backward in the concept of full funding of pension plans which, under the most acceptable of the current views, requires funding towards coverage of all pension obligation. Consistent with these views, the Regulations of the Internal Revenue Service with regard to termination of pension plans provide that contingent liabilities as well as matured liabilities must be fully taken care of before any return of funds to the company is possible.

All accrued pension rights, whether or not they have matured to the point of being vesting rights, should be the concern of the reinsurance arrangement.

CONCLUSION

There are few things so tragic in the lives of employees and their families as default on welfare and pension benefits to which they are entitled. The right to these benefits are earned and paid for by the employees during their working years. Substantial portions of negotiated economic packages, which otherwise would be paid to employees as wages, are earmarked under our agreements to finance these benefits.

You, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Subcommittee are to be commended for conducting these hearings to develop additional protections for participants and beneficiaries of welfare and pension plans. Intensive studies and investigations have demonstrated the great need for legislation to assure payment of earned benefits when due. There is elaborate legislation on the books to regulate banks and protect the savings of depositors. The need to safeguard the "savings" of employees and their families under welfare and pension plans is equally great. Accordingly, we urge prompt enactment of laws which will deal not only with the substance of the bills pending before this Subcommittee, but also with the funding, vesting, guarantee and reinsurance principles discussed above and in the statement submitted by the AFL-CIO.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to state the position of the United Steelworkers of America on this most important subject.

The Measure You Give

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the Palm Sunday sermon of the Reverend Charles Edward Berger, Th. D., D.D., rector of All Saints' Episcopal Church, Chevy Chase, Md. Dr. Berger has an important message for all Americans who are trou-

bled by the recent outbreak of disorders in our land.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEASURE YOU GIVE

(Text of sermon preached at All Saints' Episcopal Church, Chevy Chase, Md., by Rev. Charles Edward Berger, Th. D., D.D., on Palm Sunday, April 7, 1968, at the 9 and 11 o'clock services)

The extraordinary conditions in our city and in our country have forced so many changes in our schedule and have required so many announcements in our service that I cannot give anything approaching full-scale treatment to the last of the series of sermons on "Difficult Sayings of Jesus." But I want to give a whole set of difficult sayings, which appears in St. Luke, and which ends with a particularly appropriate saying of Jesus, which in the context of this hour, strikes me as especially difficult. I refer to the 37th and 38th verses of the 6th chapter of St. Luke: "Judge not, and you will not be judged; condemn not, and you will not be condemned; forgive, and you will be forgiven; give, and it will be given to you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, will be put into your lap. For the measure you give will be the measure you get back."

Measure these for difficulty! For which is the more difficult just now? Withholding judgment on the act of the assassin, on the actions of the Stokely Carmichaels? On the burners, on the looters, on those who interfere with firemen as they try to extinguish the flames, and then reset the fires after they have been put out? Do you find it harder not to condemn whoever decided to let the looters loot, to instruct the police not to use their weapons to stop the theft of perhaps millions of dollars' worth of the property of others? Is that what's hardest, or is it forgiveness? Do you find it more difficult to forgive those slave-traders who first brought slaves to this hemisphere, more difficult to forgive those racists who have perpetuated the problem then begun, or more difficult to forgive the mirror-image racists who speak of violence in the same breath with black power? Giving may be something you find especially difficult. They are all hard—so hard that many of us simply give up. But the really threatening statement of Jesus in this group of them is the summary: *the measure you give will be the measure you get back*. It's enough to make a sensible, sensitive person tremble: you will be judged by the standards you use in judging others. You will be shown no more generosity than you show. You will be forgiven no more than you forgive, condemned no less than you condemn. *The measure you give will be the measure you get back!*

This can hardly be called "Gospel," good news. It is very bad news—especially bad news. It is so brutal that if it were the last word of Christ we would have to accuse him of divine brutality. It doesn't give us even a prayer—not a ghost of a chance for salvation. It's the hardest and harshest kind of rule—as threatening a set of words as could be devised. Not for a moment are we justified in calling it good news!

But it is not the last word of Jesus. It belongs to his clarification of the meaning of the commandments which we fall so miserably in trying to obey. The good news comes later—comes in the prayer, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," comes in the faith that through the life and death of Jesus, God has acted to save the unforgiving, judgmental, condemnatory likes of us. We can hear hearing so difficult a word of Jesus as that the measure we give will be the measure we get not because we are so charitable in our judgments of others, but because God is prepared to hear Christ's plea

and to forgive. We believe that the Father heard Christ's prayer, and the resurrection was his affirmative reply. Yes, he will forgive and save us, despite our unworthiness.

But how uncomfortable, how disturbing, how difficult to contemplate that saying remains. The judgment you give will be the judgment you get. The measure you give will be the measure you get back. . . .

Congratulations to Graduates

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Each year it is my privilege to congratulate the hundreds of students in the Second District of Michigan who are completing their high school education. In this time when education is so important, their accomplishments should be recognized by the community and the Nation.

At the same time, I encourage all young people who have the ability and the desire to continue their education in one of the excellent colleges, universities, community colleges, and technical schools of our Nation. The Federal Government has extensive programs of student aid and it is my privilege to insure that all graduating students are aware of the options open to them.

My letter and certificate are printed hereafter in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you upon your pending graduation. High school graduation is a happy time for celebration, but it is also a significant achievement which will hold great meaning throughout your life.

Enclosed is a copy of "The American Creed" by William Tyler Page—a creed which helps to give me direction in my work. I hope you will use it as a guide in planning and carrying out your future activities.

Also you'll find with this letter a pamphlet outlining continuing educational opportunities. This may be of help if you have not already made decisions about college. If you have decided to continue your education, you may find some helpful tips in the area of financial assistance.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can ever be of assistance to you in any way. Best wishes for every success.

Sincerely,

MARVIN L. ESCH,
Member of Congress.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED
(By William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Presented to [each student] with congratulations upon graduation from High School. May the highest ideals of American citizen-

ship guide you in a life of success, happiness, and achievement.

MARVIN L. ESCH,
Member of Congress, Second District
of Michigan.

Rights for the Disadvantaged

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a fine editorial, appearing in the April 15, 1968, issue of the Watertown Daily Times, edited and published by John B. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson gives editorial recognition to the need for priorities and conservation of resources for the Vietnam war and the war against poverty by limiting or delaying spending for other less vital aspects of the American life. The editorial follows:

RIGHTS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Four national religious leaders are asking for an economic bill of rights for the disadvantaged, first cost \$10,000,000,000. On the day that the federal taxes are due, some critics may not enthuse over the idea that there should be this further financial commitment although the need for this sum and greater sums is clearly apparent. Much has been said about the difficulties in dividing the national resources between the war in Vietnam and the war on poverty in the United States. Has anyone made a genuine effort to conserve resources for the Vietnam war and the war against poverty by limiting or delaying spending for other aspects of American life?

The other day bids were received in Albany to install mile point markers in Jefferson and Lewis counties at the cost of \$22,410. Other bids would spend \$22,000 for similar markers in Clinton and Franklin counties. A third bid of \$20,000 was for St. Lawrence county, for a total of \$64,000. How about postponing this kind of spending until programs of more elevated social purpose are accomplished?

As much as we dislike the alewives, the pressure is on to get another \$100,000 to start a control program July 1. Alewives have been around a long time, and as disgusting as they are along the shores of the Great Lakes, they could be tolerated for a while longer were this money, together with other similar items, to be spent on accomplishing something in the ghettos of America.

The anti-air pollution people are loud and long in their clamor for monies, arguing for billions of dollars. What good is clean air for disease-ridden housing?

What is the figure for billboard control on the highways? We don't like the billboards any more than the next person, but aren't the needs of the disadvantaged greater than roads without billboards?

What about the highways themselves? A moratorium on them would permit the use of many millions to achieve better life and opportunity for the disadvantaged.

The other day one of the under secretaries in the Commerce department wondered if Americans were going to fritter away their resources for color television sets in the face of this huge social need by the Negroes and the other poor. The American people will sacrifice their ambitions to buy color television sets just as soon as government will sacrifice its ambitions to misdirect quantities of the national resources toward unnecessary objectives in periods like the present.

Don't blame the Vietnam war for soaking up all the money. Remove sums from outer space, surveying the bottom of the Atlantic ocean, a trip or two to the North Pole or the South Pole, and these amounts, with those sequestered here and there from non-priority projects, and the fullscale "extraordinary action" recommended by the religious leaders could be organized and launched with more money to spend than there would be mechanisms to spend it.

Recently a small community of 2,867 in Missouri was planning to commit itself to a bond issue of \$140,000,000, the money to be spent on a new aluminum factory which would employ 800 people. Whether the nation needs any more aluminum factories at this time is for the experts to decide, but the laymen are quite aware that aluminum is in surplus supply today. The point is how many communities are there which are willing to bond themselves for \$50,000 per citizen, man, woman and child, for a direct undertaking in behalf of the disadvantaged? If communities were so disposed, they probably would be able to benefit many more than the 800 who would be working for an aluminum company which in the end would be the chief beneficiary.

If the moment in history has arrived for government to address itself primarily to those who are in the lowest economic status, then it should delay projects in behalf of those who are much better off. How many lake property owners today are ready to pick up their own dead alewives, drive for a few more years along the roads with their layers of billboards, pass up the opportunity to go to the theater under the Council of the Arts, agree that before they worry about breathing polluted air, they will worry more about tobacco. We can get along for quite a spell not seeing those mileage markers on the roads, including those medallions that measure the distances down to one-tenth of a mile.

These are not the happiest thoughts on income tax day, April 15, 1968, but money is being spent for all these purposes together with innumerable others, none of them having anything to do with the economic bill of rights for the disadvantaged.

Before It Is Too Late

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, those who counsel us to imitate the economic philosophy of the British would do well to read up on the history of Great Britain. Ray Tschimperle, editor of the Weekly Valley Herald in Chaska, Minn., provides a brief and valuable summary as a beginner. I include his recent editorial at this point in my remarks:

BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

The history of Great Britain during the past quarter century is reminiscent of the inevitable end of a man who lives by the advice of a quack doctor. By the time the last dose of quackery has been administered, the patient is too sick to know what has killed him.

For years, Great Britain blazed a meteoric path along the road to a welfare state under the guidance of textbook theorists and socialists. For years, the "progress" of Britain along this road was held up as a shining example to the United States. Cradle to the grave security became the ruling political philosophy of Britain. That philosophy is now bankrupt. No more is heard of British progress. Postmortems have taken the place of progress reports. The economic doctors of the time are but names in the history books.

Experts now are busy analyzing the "British decline." According to one authority, an associate professor of history and humanities at a leading university, one of the many major problems facing Britain today is her reluctance to face up to the fact that "she no longer is a major worldpower." This is something like telling the luckless victim of the quack doctor "you're dead brother." Before it is too late, we might well question some of the economic medicine we have been swallowing in our own country.

Resolutions Drafted by the National Association of Pro America

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have had an opportunity to meet with the southern California chapter of Pro America in San Diego County, and I have found that this is a dedicated patriotic group, striving for a better America, and constitutional government.

The National Association of Pro America has drafted a set of resolutions on many of the issues now pending before the Congress, and I include these in the RECORD for the attention of the other Members, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRO AMERICA

DISARMAMENT

Whereas the people of the United States of America, under terms of the Test Ban Treaty and the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, have allowed their representatives to commit the nation to a program of general and complete disarmament; and

Whereas the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provides that the United States will follow a definite step-by-step schedule of reductions in arms and armaments (which is steadily being accomplished) in direct contradiction to one of the main purposes of our federations of States under the Constitution, namely, defense against foreign foes; and

Whereas at a time when the United States is confronted with an enemy which has openly declared its intention to rule the world, and has relentlessly pursued that goal since its inception, our armed forces and armaments are to be replaced by a so-called "United Nations Peace Force", which is in fact a World Army, therefore be it

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America call for repeal of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, abrogation of the Test Ban Treaty, and the abrogation of any other treaties and agreements which will disarm the United States and subjugate the United States to a United Nations World Army.

MASS MEDICATION

Whereas individual liberty and freedom of choice in private pursuits to the extent that the welfare and liberty of others is not jeopardized, is inherent in the principles and concept of constitutional government in the United States, and

Whereas involuntary mass medication denies the right of free choice to the individual; and

Whereas Mass Medication unconstitutionally injects the State into the private sector, which is a dangerous and foreboding practice;

Therefore, be it resolved that no power be granted the State to practice mass medication and invasion into the private lives of individuals for health reasons, except for pro-

tecting the public health from communicable dangers.

LIMITING OF THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has, to the grave concern of vast numbers of our citizens, interfered in the fields of education, crime, subversion, religion, apportionment of voting districts within the States, and voting qualifications; and

Whereas this unconstitutional interference and federal control will have serious and far-reaching consequences, destroying our federal system and affecting the life of every individual, and changing the traditions, customs and culture of our entire society; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States, Article III, Section 2, after setting forth the types of cases in which the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction, says: "... The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make"; therefore be it

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America petition Congress to exercise its constitutional authority to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in the above mentioned fields.

INVASION OF PRIVACY

Whereas another year for the census taking of population will arrive in 1970; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America states that the proper function of the census is to determine the apportionment and representation of the States in the House; and

Whereas refusal to answer questions of a personal and private nature has resulted in penalties; therefore

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America beseech the Congress to limit the 1970 Census to the Constitutional purpose of collecting population data only.

CRIME AND RIOTS

Whereas crime, racial, juvenile, and Communist-inspired and directed guerrilla warfare in the United States has become a challenging problem; and

Whereas the United States Supreme Court and Justice Department continue to reinterpret our laws governing crime and criminals, thereby emasculating said laws and causing concurrence in the lower courts; and

Whereas this leniency toward crime is creating disregard for law and order generally; and

Whereas the present administration appears unable or unwilling to cope with this growing menace except through continued expenditures; and

Whereas crime increases in direct proportion to the amount of money spent; therefore

Be it resolved that the National Association of Pro America urge all communities; cities, counties, states—to assume their inherited obligations and responsibilities in the activities within their boundaries, making the concept of "self-help" in the American tradition desirable and attainable; and

Be it further resolved that a more articulate reaffirmation of America's religious and moral heritage be stressed.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Whereas sensitivity training is conducted in groups employing the method of criticism of self and of others with the stated purpose to increase social sensitivity and behavioral flexibility; and

Whereas because Sensitivity Training promotes group-centered thinking or conformity, the participant becomes psychologically dependent upon the group and can rarely solve his own problems; and

Whereas sensitivity training is being used in various forms in business, industry, government and civic organizations, schools and youth groups for all ages, as well as

in churches, known under different names such as T-Groups, Leadership Training, Group Dynamics, etc.;

Therefore be it resolved: That the National Association of Pro America recommends that the public make a concentrated effort to investigate the probable serious dangers inherent in this type of program.

OBSCENITY

Whereas the newsstands of America are being flooded with obscene literature unfit for the youthful reader; and

Whereas law enforcement officials have repeatedly testified that there is a direct relationship between crime and the distribution of printed filth; and

Whereas the United States Investigation Committee on Juvenile Delinquency has reported that 75% to 90% of all obscene literature eventually reaches the hands of teenagers and younger children; and

Whereas present law is not conducive to successful prosecution of smut peddlers who are profiting millions of dollars while degrading our society and culture;

Therefore be it resolved: That the National Association of Pro America call on their duly elected representatives in the State legislatures and in Washington to present legislation to strengthen the antiobscenity laws;

Be it further resolved that the above action be aimed directly at the pornography industry and in no way attempt to regulate the reading habits of any individual, banning no books except those adjudged by a jury of our peers to violate the moral standards of our nation.

HOLIDAYS

Whereas there is a movement to ask the United States Congress to make all non-religious holidays fall on Mondays or Fridays regardless of their proper dates; and

Whereas these patriotic holidays have been established by Congress of the United States to honor the memory of our country's great men and great historic occasions; and

Whereas such degrading of our history will but add to the growing indifference and disrespect that is noticeable in many of our citizens even now; therefore

Be it resolved: That the National Association of Pro America urge that rather than tamper with dates of traditional historic and patriotic events, we make an effort to see that more emphasis be placed upon the significance of these dates and their celebration.

U.S.S. "PUEBLO"

Whereas on January 23, 1968 the North Korean Communists seized the U.S.S. *Pueblo* in international waters; and

Whereas a military vessel is considered territory of a nation just as an embassy is, making this seizure an act of war; and

Whereas the National Security Council, consisting of five men, rather than the Department of the Navy, is said to be in charge of such communication ships; and

Whereas messages were being relayed to the National Security Agency and thereby to the National Security Council, during the considerable time while the ship was under attack; and

Whereas the National Security Council was also in command of the U.S.S. *Liberty* when it was attacked in the Mediterranean Sea on June 8, 1967, without provocation or warning, apparently due to confused communications from the National Security Council, but with the loss of thirty-four U.S. crewmen and great damage to a defenseless ship; Therefore

Be it resolved that the National Association of Pro America demand an investigation concerning who was responsible in these cases, and if necessary, that direction of such military operations be taken from the National Security Council and restored to the Armed Services as the Constitution provides.

CONTROL OF THE OCEAN FLOOR AND MINERAL WEALTH

Whereas the proposal by President Johnson that the "Control of the Seabed and Ocean Floor" be given to the United Nations; and

Whereas the United States government and numerous states derive millions of dollars in revenue from oil recovered from the ocean floor; and

Whereas the seabeds off the coasts of America are a vital part of both our economy and safety; and

Whereas because of a powerful, unfriendly undersea fleet with a keen interest in the ocean around our coasts, it is vitally important that we maintain control over submarine territory adjacent to our shores;

Therefore be it resolved: That the National Association of Pro America protest any agreement that our government might make to commit our oceanic wealth to the United Nations and URGE that our underwater territorial rights and mineral resources be protected.

REGIONAL TREATIES UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Whereas by secret agreement in 1946, the Undersecretary for Political and Security Council Affairs has always been a Communist; and

Whereas according to the United Nations Charter, Chapter VIII, Regional Arrangements "The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security"; and

Whereas our military plans are probably made known to Russia and North Vietnam through this Communist United Nations' officer; and

Whereas the present Vietnam conflict is being fought under the SEATO regional arrangement; and

Whereas the United States is committed by other regional treaty arrangements such as NATO and OAS to a possible future military involvement;

Therefore, be it resolved by the National Association of Pro America that the United States of America denounce these regional United Nations' treaties, rescinding the enabling legislations, and resume our policy of winning wars, including the present one in Vietnam; and

Be it further resolved that we reaffirm the 1966 Resolution urging the withdrawal from the United Nations as dictated by our national best interests and honorable commitments.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION ON QUEMOY AND MATSU

Whereas President Johnson has intimated through a State Department spokesman that the United States is considering giving up the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, which has been aided financially through Nationalist China; and

Whereas these islands are not the property of the U.S., but belong to Nationalist China, whose defense is their responsibility; and

Whereas it would bring no relief to the government of Nationalist China if the soldiers who have been defending these islands should be withdrawn, but instead would bring a threat because Red Chinese soldiers could be released from their mainland posts and the ports of Amoy and Foochow would be free for use as a springboard for attack on Nationalist China; and

Whereas the possession of these islands is a vital part of the defense of the Eastern Pacific and all areas in between to the very shores of our mainland coasts;

Therefore be it resolved that the National Association of Pro America urge that the United States not desert Nationalist China in the defense of their vital island outposts.

Time To Question

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, April 22 in Oklahoma is the date of the big '89 celebration. This year marks the 79th anniversary of the April 22, 1889, Oklahoma land rush, and would have been the 39th time the event has drawn thousands to Guthrie where the townspeople go all out to play host. Some 75,000 persons were expected at the American Legion-sponsored 3-day festivities.

But the celebration has been called off.

The reason: "The way things are since Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated."

Many public officials question the wisdom of bringing together great numbers of persons at this time, and more especially if the crowd is "demonstrating."

At this point I insert into the RECORD the following editorial from the April 6, 1968, Daily Oklahoman of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

ASSASSINATION'S TRAGIC SEQUEL

It was a tragic commentary on the non-violence espoused by Dr. Martin Luther King that his assassination at Memphis should have had a sequel in bloodshed and violence elsewhere.

It was an ironic earlier upshot that the first urban riot of the approaching summer should have received its impetus from a demonstration that Dr. King and his followers intended to be peaceful. The surging violence his death precipitated in scattered cities was a bleak augury for the long, hot months ahead.

Floyd McKissick, national director of the Congress for Racial Equality, says that non-violence "is now a dead philosophy." But it has long been apparent that the circumstances underlying the original concept of civil disobedience were undergoing drastic change.

Earlier in the movement, Dr. King and his followers had been successful in controlling his massive demonstrations. As long as this was possible, the marches occurred within the constitutional limitations of peaceable assembly and served the useful purpose of conveying to the white conscience the justice of the civil rights cause.

But extreme black militants more recently have been infiltrating and commandeering the movement, giving it a youthful and often criminal element it couldn't control. This was apparent at Memphis where youthful hooligans converted Dr. King's intended "non-violent" demonstration into an occasion for looting and mayhem. His hurried exit attested his inability to control events.

The underlying premise of non-violence is destroyed when its leaders concede their inability to keep the demonstrations within the bounds of peaceable assembly. If the movement has reached a point at which its own leaders are beginning to question whether non-violence is possible, the law-abiding majorities of both races are entitled to ask the law enforcement agencies whether violence is preventable.

What is responsible for the changing conditions of violence which sometimes make it difficult to distinguish between the practical results of peaceful advocacy and incitation to riot? Negroes have been successful in getting a great many new civil rights laws enacted since Dr. King began his campaign

of civil disobedience. In this regard there should be less racial unrest rather than more.

Of course, the underlying evils of prejudice, unequal housing, education and employment remain. But at any rate these conditions are little worse and probably better than they were five or six years ago when it was possible to arrange a "non-violent" demonstration without incurring the imminent risk of its becoming a riot.

Certainly a factor in the changed situation is the frequent reluctance of the enforcement agencies to deal effectively with lawlessness when it occurs in the context of "civil disobedience." To look the other way when looting and burning are taking place is to invite still greater lawlessness at the next convenient pretext.

It may be true, as Floyd McKissick suggests, that Dr. King's philosophy of non-violence died with him at Memphis. It may be true, on the other hand, that the concept lost its validity when Dr. King lost control of his demonstrators.

Plainly, the time has come to question the wisdom of such massive demonstrations as the one planned soon in Washington. In the altered circumstances surrounding "non-violence," it could result in a tragedy greater than Dr. King's untimely passing.

The Importance of Communications

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as our society and our world become more and more complex, it is increasingly important that we communicate effectively.

It is essential that governments know how to communicate with people and people with their governments; it is essential that individuals know how to communicate with one another and that groups and organizations have the ability to communicate effectively, both among themselves and with their governments.

The subject of communications was discussed recently by Mr. Lloyd Wendt, editor of Chicago's *American*, in an address at a career conference of Theta Sigma Phi in Chicago. Mr. Wendt's timely remarks were reprinted in the April 1968 edition of the *Quill*, the magazine of Sigma Delta Chi journalism society.

Mr. Wendt's remarks follow:

ARE WE COMMUNICATING SUCCESSFULLY?

(By Lloyd Wendt)

(NOTE.—These thoughts were expressed by Editor Wendt recently when he addressed a career conference of Theta Sigma Phi in Chicago.)

Recently an eminent educator declared that today's newspapers fail the public because they do not communicate and, in fact, they merely confuse the reader.

How do I know this? I read it in a newspaper.

I suppose I am committing one of the prime sins often attributed to newspapermen when, in my opening sentence, I used the expression "eminent educator." This is an exaggeration and a rather loose construction. In a strict sense, the gentleman I refer to is either eminent, except in his own limited, esoteric circles, nor am I sure he is an educator, except by his own prescription.

Our friend (and, here again, you see that I am in semantic difficulty) has a certain

prominence in a somewhat introverted group of social scientists who specialize in the evaluation of popular media. So possibly this person might be called eminent. He and his colleagues have helped to develop a peculiar terminology by which they obfuscate their rituals and exchanges of signals as did the medicine man in the primordial tribal societies. Since our hero helps to initiate neophytes into the mysteries of this signalling art, I suppose he could be called an educator.

And, if I may further digress, I would not care to be tagged with any denigration of his cult when I refer to its "peculiar" terminology. I do not by any means use peculiar as meaning queer; but rather as meaning "one's own." We all know, of course, that the derivation of peculiar is from *pecus*, meaning cattle, going back to the days when cowhides were used for money—thus, *peculium*, private property, and *pecunia*, money; and also *pecuniary*. So, peculiar, in this sense, means not queer terminology, but "one's own."

If any of you should assume that I am referring to Marshall McLuhan in this discussion, I can assure you that I am not. It is true that he diffuses a great deal of pernicious nonsense about the popular media, but, for the most part, he is understandable in his perverse way. He also is quite obviously eminent and quite possibly an educator since he is on a university faculty and is so recognized by his peers.

No, I am indicating a contemporary communicator who appears to be in the Osgood/Suci/Tannenbaum school of communication. I refer, for example, to their definition of a sign or word in "The Measurement of Meaning." I quote:

"The meaning of a sign has been defined as a representational mediation process, a complex of reaction divisible into some unknown but finite number of components. This learning theory construct has been tentatively coordinated with our measuring operations by identifying this complex mediation reaction with a point in a multi-dimensional space. The projections of this point onto the various dimensions of semantic space are assumed to correspond to what component mediating reactions are associated with the sign and with what degree of intensity."

If you should feel that I have left something out—or put something in—I can admit to you that I have the same feeling, but I didn't. It's unexpurgated, the sort of thing today's newspapermen must cope with.

I guess I come from a simple, empirical school, that believes in using headlines to get attention, and believes in saying what you mean. We newspaper people use headlines to get the reader's attention: television and radio have other ingenious and more nefarious devices, but all of us are trying to reach the greatest possible number of people each day, which is something many critics of the press don't seem to understand.

In my opinion, newspapers are doing an excellent job of solving practical communication problems and, after you read Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, you realize that we do have problems.

Again, I make a pragmatic evaluation. More people buy newspapers today than ever before; more than loaves of bread or bottles of milk. In 1967, according to *Editor & Publisher International Yearbook*, daily newspaper circulation increased by 163,700 to an all-time high of 61,560,952.

Ah, say some critics, but that is exactly the objection: you say "more people buy". That is what is wrong! Newspapers try to get bought! They try to attract the interest of people and therefore they hit a low, common denominator.

This might in some ways be true. If our forefathers had thought of it they might have taken care not to create a democracy in the first place because you always take that chance with the common denominator: also they might not have embarked on a

capitalistic society, had they known how hard it is to sell at a profit.

A few years ago when I was visiting *Pravda* in Moscow I was rather amazed at the calmness in the news department. No excitement, no hurry, and in *Pravda* few headlines and not much news.

I spoke to one of the editors about this, and he said quite frankly that they had no problem to hurry to publish any news because first the government and party officials had to pass on it anyway. *Pravda* doesn't have to rely on its saleability, and therefore lacks some of our communication problems. But I am an unreconstructed populist: I think the people are quite bright and that if we talk to them in their own language and tell them the truth we'll wind up with quite good government and a quite good society, and we'll sell a lot of newspapers. In other words, I think newspapers communicate well because people find us as vital as bread and milk. We speak the language of the people and they want and need us.

A few years ago I read a book called "Understanding Media" by Marshall McLuhan, and this just about wrecked my newspaper career because for a while I accepted the popular misconception that McLuhan knew what he was doing. When he said that newspapers were a hot medium and television was cool, I bought that because I came from a generation which thought that hot jazz was the greatest thing going and that a cool cat was something dragged out of a refrigerator. But later I realized that McLuhan didn't mean what I thought he said. Actually he disproves of hot media because there is no personal involvement in it. When a newspaper reader reads words and forms pictures and emotional and intellectual response inside his brain, he is not really participating as much as when he sits before a TV set eating popcorn and drinking beer. That's what I get from McLuhan.

I have now come to the conclusion that McLuhanism is greatly over-rated. I'd like to quote from Joseph Wood Krutch's article in a recent *American Scholar*, since he says it so much better than I can:

"Mr. McLuhan is the first to extol inarticulateness and illiteracy as the virtues of a dawning new day. And that is transvaluating values with a vengeance."

Krutch suggests that the reason that McLuhan is wrong in so many of his conclusions is that he is wrong in some of his "facts" on which they are based. Par ex: In describing the Renaissance camera obscura, McLuhan wrote in "Understanding Media": "But early spectators saw these images (in camera obscura) upside down. For this reason the lens was introduced—in order to turn the picture right side up." This, of course, is completely false. The lens was not introduced for the purpose of turning the image right side up. As a matter of fact, as everyone but McLuhan knows, even though you use a lens in a camera, the image is upside down. That was why the young lady tied a rope around her mini skirt when her picture was being taken. She knew the photographer would see her upside down. If McLuhan is no better at communications than he is with optics, perhaps we should start ignoring him.

A few days ago I read a report from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, titled: "A Center Report/The Message of the Media." The title should provide some warning: The editor of the article at least had been McLuhanized. But I was happy to discover that the report was based on the comments of people like Nick Williams, editor of the *Los Angeles Times* who, I think, understands communications. Williams did not disappoint me. He said: "To be successful, a newspaper must be edited at two equally necessary levels and for two equally necessary purposes. It must do some things editorially to attract a massive circulation, and do them very well; and it must do some things to achieve prestige. The first, of

course, must collide with the second, and success comes with the ability to avoid collision in writing intelligently about public affairs, we are writing not for the bulk of our readers, but for the elite among them."

I recommend those observations to all of you, and especially to people who want all papers to be like the *New York Times*.

Mass media is under an obligation to be mass media. In the United States we cannot impose readership upon all loyal members of the party, as does *Pravda*. We must win readership, readers of all educational and economic levels and many environmental and cultural backgrounds. Generally, a good editor understands what are vital interests and issues to the greatest possible number of persons. He relies on the connotative as well as the denotative values in reaching these people; so the good editor understands and appreciates the environment and motivation of his readers, just as does the good politician. The good editor makes sure that his media reaches the public he seeks: he makes sure to get attention; then he gives them the message. He mingles what he knows they ought to have with what he knows they want. He is honest and as objective as possible. And he always remembers that if you don't reach them you can't teach them.

In this country we are continuing to reach them, almost with greater success than any country outside Finland. In the process of reaching I think we also elevate people because we have a free press, a competitive press, a responsible press. Maybe we should do better with the elevation process, but on the whole I think our mass media, newspapers, radio and television are doing rather well.

You asked me to answer the question: Are we communicating successfully? I think it's about time I answered the question. My answer is "Yes."

Another Year of Farm Prosperity

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, nonfarm people have come to realize that the farm "prosperity" the administration loves to talk about is without the slightest relation to reality. John Weber, editor of the *Murray County Herald* in Slayton, Minn., provides some hard evidence in support. I include his recent editorial on this subject at this point in the RECORD:

ANOTHER YEAR OF FARM PROSPERITY

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and President Johnson himself keep telling the nation's farmers how well off they are under the present administration, but recent figures released by the USDA lead us to wonder how much longer farmers will be able to afford the "prosperity."

According to the USDA figures, Minnesota farmers had the highest cash sales of farm products in history last year—but their net income dropped by eleven percent. In short, the old cost-price squeeze got to us again, and this time more seriously than ever before.

How much longer can people of rural America afford to go on thinking that democratic administrations represent any kind of a solution to their problems? How much longer can they afford this type of prosperity?

Much of agriculture's troubles last year are attributed to a sharp reduction in federal farm program payments and corresponding increases in the costs of production. Does this sound like the nation's capitol and the ad-

ministration offices are filled with friends of the farmer?

Another four years of this type of federal help and leadership and there won't be an average of 18 farmers per township in Murray county—and if the present trend continues they won't be netting as much as they did 20 years ago on a quarter section of land.

Amend Veterans Training Act

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, two of my Minnesota colleagues have joined me in introducing H.R. 16594, in an attempt to amend the farm cooperative on-the-farm college training program for veterans as authorized in the 1966 session of Congress.

This section requires that eligible veterans spend 12 hours weekly in the classroom to earn college credit. For this the veterans receive \$105 per month, while the veterans in vocational courses receive \$130 per month for on-the-job training.

Farming today must be run as a business if it is to be a profitable investment. The average farmer is now required to have an investment of over \$73,000, and frequently, he markets over a quarter of a million dollars in produce annually. Thus, the greatest skill and training is needed in financing and accounting. I think this change in agriculture is very well stated in an editorial from the *Coatesville, Pa., Record*, from which I would like to quote a paragraph.

Not only does it take a small fortune to buy the land, implements, and building improvements to start farming, it takes a continuing annual investment that would startle the ad-man's wife out of her wits, to think that the farmer is managing a gross income a digit or so bigger than her husband's salary. Of course, the marketing consultant may have over-stated a bit when he talked about affluence. We don't know many affluent farmers. But we do know a lot who are sophisticated—who can talk with authority about animal husbandry and genetics, the latest developments in fertilizers, hybrid seeds, crop rotation, internal combustion motors, theories on irrigation, capital gains and estate taxes. If that suggests that farming has come to be a science for which a lot of special training and continuing study is required, then you've seen the point the ad-men have been missing.

The 12-hours-per-week requirement is really the inflexible element for the young farmers. It is primarily because of this weekly evening hour provision that there are only three veterans enrolled in this program in the entire United States out of the over 300,000 which are eligible. My own State of Minnesota has none. Yet, there is a great need for this advanced schooling. This can be accomplished by cutting the weekly hourly requirements for evening classes to 6 and 9 hours, with a proportionate reduction in the monthly compensation.

In addition to the need for becoming knowledgeable with the most modern accounting and banking procedures, there is a need for greater detailed in-

formation of legal procedures and instruments. These young farmers are also vitally interested in the area of public relations. Many of these men are convinced that the present farm organizations will have to merge into one organization in order to speak with a single voice that is both eloquent and persuasive.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to make a study of the implementation of this on-the-farm cooperative job-training section of the Veterans Educational Assistance Act in their own districts so that they can become familiar with the extent of the need for this program.

A Friend of the Consumer

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, the interests of the American consumer have been a major concern of the Federal Government. Historic legislation, such as the truth-in-packaging bill, has been signed into law and the resources of the executive are being brought to bear.

A consumer education program has now been established. In many ways, it is an outgrowth of a program set up in 1962 at Lincoln High School in Yonkers, N.Y. The founder of that program, David Schoenfeld, is now Director for Consumer Education of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

Recognition of the important role of this program and the talents of its director was made in a *New York Times* article by John D. Morris. I present the article herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

U.S. AIDE TEACHES CONSUMER LORE: HE HELPS MISS FURNESS TO PROMOTE EDUCATION

(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, April 14, 1968.—Betty Furness, President Johnson's special assistant for consumer affairs, is relying largely on a brawny, brainy former college wrestler to develop and direct an expanded consumer education program for her office.

David Schoenfeld, 44 years old, six feet tall and weighing 215 pounds, has been on the job since Jan. 1 and hopes to have the program well under way within a few months.

So far, he has spent most of his time touring the country and making sales talks to educators, businessmen and other community and state leaders.

"Basically," he explained in an interview, "my job is to promote consumer education."

One of his main goals, he explained, is to promote the establishment of consumer education courses "from kindergarten through the university level."

CITES FAVORABLE REACTION

Another, with equal priority, is for schools and other community organizations to provide consumer education for adults, with special emphasis on teaching low-income and elderly persons.

The reaction to his sales talks, he said, has been "100 per cent favorable." Surprisingly, he added, he has sometimes found businessmen to be more interested than educators.

"The intelligent, ethical businessman wants an educated consumer," he remarked.

Mr. Schoenfeld's official title is director

for consumer education of the President's committee on consumer interests. Miss Furness is chairman of the cabinet-level committee, which functions something like a board of directors for Federal consumer activities.

His abbreviated definition of consumer education is "the preparation of the individual for the art of everyday living so that he gets maximum utilization and satisfaction from his income."

MULTITUDE OF SUBJECTS

This covers a multitude of subjects from buying food, clothing and other necessities to combating fraud and deception. Budgeting and money managing, purchasing and maintaining an automobile, renting an apartment, buying a house and determining the cost and value or shortcoming of consumer credit are among the many other topics.

Mr. Schoenfeld, teacher of economics and consumer education at Lincoln High School, Yonkers, N.Y., for the last six years, was a part-time consultant to Miss Furness and her predecessor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, for three years before taking his present full-time job. Miss Furness succeeded Mrs. Peterson last May.

At Lincoln High School in 1962, Mr. Schoenfeld set up what Mrs. Peterson and others have described as a model consumer education program. A novel aspect of the now thriving program is the blending of practical consumer matters into courses in standard subjects.

For example, a mathematics class may work on problems of credit, interest rates and banking. Or an English class may analyze the meaning and nuances of words used in commercial advertisements.

Aside from continuing his promotional travel, Mr. Schoenfeld plans to establish his office as "sort of a clearing house" for information on consumer education.

COMPILES BIBLIOGRAPHY

He is now working with the American Library Association on a comprehensive bibliography of books and other teaching materials. He also plans to establish guidelines for courses and curricula in schools and universities and for adult education programs.

He said he expected to cooperate with labor unions, the United States Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity and various other public and private groups.

Sales, rentals and exchanges of books and other teaching materials such as film strips and charts are some of the cooperative ideas he has in mind.

At present, his staff consists of a program assistant, Mrs. Olinda Brown, and a secretary, Mrs. Helen B. Johnson. He has the authority to hire four more professional assistants and hopes to do so by July at the latest.

Mr. Schoenfeld was a member of the intramural wrestling team at Brooklyn College, where he earned a bachelor of arts degree in economics. Friends report that he also excels in archery, swimming, fishing and bridge.

He holds a master of business administration degree from the University of Southern California and has done further post-graduate work at Manhattan College, City College of New York and New York University. He was born in New York City, is married and has four children.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 91st day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Our Debt and Foreign Giveaway

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, for years and years I have protested against excessive American giveaway in its foreign aid programs. Whether by outright grant or long-term—40 years with nominal interest—loans, we have wasted much of our wealth.

I think it is terribly wrong to take money from American citizens by taxes—which they can be jailed for not paying—and then give it away to foreign nations many of whom have no debt at all, and all of whom have vastly less debt than we do in the United States. Yet this is precisely what administration after administration has done, ever since the days of the Marshall plan, which started on the right foot but never should have been allowed to become an integral part of American foreign policy.

The figures are deeply disturbing, as an advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co. in the April 29, 1968, issue of U.S. News & World Report points out. I include this information at this point in the RECORD so that others may have ready reference to a total of foreign aid that is at least twice as much as it ought to have been. This sort of program ought now to be ended and our foreign "adventures" of this type confined to contributions to such international agencies as the World Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Export-Import Bank. Direct bilateral foreign aid from the United States to individual foreign nations is not only wasteful, it simply does not make us friends.

The article follows:

NO WONDER WE'RE BROKE (AND GETTING WORSE)

Here is what you, the American taxpayers, have authorized your government to give or "loan" to other nations, 1945 through 1966. This was not to win the war (you had already paid for that, too) but since the Second World War's end.

And if you think it might have been an investment in the future, look down the list and see how many dependable friends you can find. Yet we are still giving away more billions—billions we haven't got, billions we have to borrow (and pay interest on) to give away, billions we desperately need at home.

Here are your gifts. What has it all accomplished?

[Source: Agency for International Development]

Albania	\$20,400,000
Austria	1,198,000,000
Belgium-Luxembourg	2,004,900,000
Czechoslovakia	193,000,000
Denmark	920,500,000
East Germany	800,000
Finland	134,400,000
France	9,409,600,000
Germany (Federal Republic)	4,997,400,000
Berlin	131,900,000
Hungary	31,500,000
Iceland	84,000,000
Ireland	146,500,000
Italy	6,092,900,000
Malta	6,100,000
Netherlands	2,470,400,000
Norway	1,236,000,000
Poland	554,500,000

Portugal	\$519,100,000
Spain	2,004,300,000
Sweden	109,000,000
United Kingdom	9,044,900,000
U.S.S.R.	186,400,000
Yugoslavia	2,863,900,000
Europe regional	2,735,000,000
Australia	275,300,000
New Zealand	27,700,000
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	125,400,000
British Solomon Islands	400,000
Tonga Island	300,000
Canada	36,300,000
Vietnam	4,590,100,000
Burma	100,600,000
Cambodia	341,100,000
China (Republic of)	4,899,500,000
Hong Kong	41,900,000
Indochina undistributed	1,535,200,000
Indonesia	834,600,000
Japan	3,972,900,000
Korea	6,676,700,000
Laos	473,400,000
Malaysia	47,500,000
Philippines	1,925,000,000
Ryukyu Islands	340,600,000
Thailand	1,089,200,000
East Asia regional	731,800,000
Afghanistan	346,400,000
Ceylon	101,500,000
Cyprus	19,300,000
Greece	3,749,400,000
India	6,769,200,000
Iran	1,752,000,000
Iraq	102,700,000
Israel	1,104,500,000
Jordan	572,800,000
Lebanon	87,900,000
Nepal	97,800,000
Pakistan	3,079,800,000
Saudi Arabia	209,100,000
Syrian Arab Republic	73,300,000
Turkey	5,039,800,000
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	1,133,300,000
Yemen	41,800,000
Central Treaty Organization	52,800,000
Near East and South Asia regional	1,082,300,000
Argentina	758,600,000
Bolivia	460,600,000
Brazil	3,185,700,000
British Honduras	4,400,000
Chile	1,242,200,000
Colombia	834,800,000
Costa Rica	149,000,000
Cuba	52,100,000
Dominican Republic	320,100,000
Ecuador	279,600,000
El Salvador	108,100,000
Guatemala	209,200,000
Guyana	24,400,000
Haiti	108,800,000
Honduras	88,500,000
Jamaica	44,300,000
Mexico	1,068,200,000
Nicaragua	133,100,000
Panama	173,000,000
Paraguay	106,200,000
Peru	678,900,000
Surinam	10,100,000
Trinidad and Tobago	52,200,000
Uruguay	119,400,000
Venezuela	392,200,000
Other West Indies	3,700,000
Regional	83,100,000
Latin America regional	997,600,000
Algeria	179,400,000
Botswana	7,400,000
Burundi	6,700,000
Cameroon	27,200,000
Central African Republic	3,500,000
Chad	5,500,000
Congo (Brazzaville)	2,200,000
Congo (Kinshasa)	351,000,000
Dahomey	9,700,000
Ethiopia	317,500,000
Gabon	5,800,000
Gambia	800,000
Ghana	174,800,000

Guinea	\$75,700,000
Ivory Coast	28,800,000
Kenya	57,200,000
Lesotho	1,100,000
Liberia	241,600,000
Libya	200,000,000
Malagasy Republic	9,600,000
Malawi	11,800,000
Mali, Republic of	18,700,000
Mauritania	3,000,000
Morocco	584,100,000
Niger	10,600,000
Nigeria	190,300,000
Rwanda	5,500,000
Senegal	21,500,000
Sierra Leone	32,500,000
Somali Republic	52,200,000
South Africa, Republic of	150,600,000
Southern Rhodesia	7,000,000
Sudan	108,400,000
Tanzania	50,000,000
Togo	12,000,000
Tunisia	487,900,000
Uganda	21,000,000
Upper Volta	6,800,000
Zambia	36,100,000
East Africa regional	18,400,000
Regional USAID/Africa	1,300,000
Africa regional	76,000,000
Nonregional total	6,462,800,000

Total, all countries.... 122,358,500,000

As we said the last time we published such a list—any sane American can write his own editorial on this subject. Or obituary.

Peace Hopes Don't Change Tax Needs

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Chronicle, in an editorial on April 14, made the very important point that the possibility of Vietnam peace negotiations does not at all lessen the urgent need for favorable action on President Johnson's tax surcharge proposal. Quoting from the editorial:

Heavy spending in Vietnam, about \$2.5 billion a month, would not be ended completely if all hostilities ceased.

The editorial goes on to say:

The President's chief economic adviser has pointed out that the hoped-for ceasefire would have little immediate impact on spending and total economic activity.

In my opinion, this situation places a special responsibility on all Members of the Congress. The tax measure has been before the Congress for many months. There has been ample time for discussion of all aspects of the President's proposal. In the words of the editorial:

The time for endless debate is over. Constructive fiscal action is needed now.

Because of the great importance of this issue to all Americans, I insert the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE HOPES DON'T CHANGE TAX NEEDS

As peace hopes for Vietnam have risen, interest in the nation's financial problems has fallen. There have even been some suggestions that the possibility of peace negotiations lessens the need for action on taxes.

That is not the case. The spending rate of the federal government has not been trimmed one iota by the possibility of nego-

tiations. Heavy spending in Vietnam, about \$2.5 billion a month, would not be ended completely if all hostilities ceased.

The troops there, now more than half a million, would still have to be maintained and supplied; the expenses of the pacification and redevelopment program would not stop.

The President's chief economic adviser has pointed out that the hoped-for ceasefire would have little immediate impact on spending and total economic activity. Regardless of how the negotiations proceed, Arthur Okun, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, believes that the money needs of the government in the coming fiscal year will not be altered much.

This brings us back to the unpleasant situation which has faced the nation for about six months. If the 10 percent surtax is not enacted by Congress and federal expenditures are not trimmed, we are going to have another \$20 billion deficit in the fiscal year starting July 1.

Heavy government borrowing to cover a similar deficit this year has helped to push up interest rates and the high level of spending has added to the inflationary fires.

Inaction on the part of the House of Representatives, particularly in regard to the tax bill, is the main problem at the moment. Following the Easter recess, the House will have to decide if it wants to accept the Senate approved tax and spending measure or initiate action of its own. The time for endless debate is over. Constructive fiscal action is needed now.

The Slob Society

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently carried an editorial on the littering of the countryside and on some of the underlying causes of that unfortunate phenomenon. This message is especially meaningful to all of us with the coming of the spring and summer, when America will again be out of doors and on the move. I commend it to the attention of all and I am accordingly pleased to insert the full text at this point in the RECORD:

THE SLOB SOCIETY

How many beer cans along the highway did you count on your way to work today? The number is on the increase. And when cans are made of aluminum, they won't rust away. They remain as a permanent memorial to modern society.

Every now and then, a plea just has to be made reminding about litter along the highways. And along the streets and the railroads and anywhere else.

The advertising fraternity does a useful job with its ads proclaiming that "every litter bit hurts." Sociologists blame the litterbug habit on all sorts of things: On the affluent society which pretties every purchase in a multiplicity of packaging—all of which must be discarded before the product can be used. Or on the cities with their compressed populations. Or on the "underculture" of America—the careless people, so-called, who just don't care how the scenery is cluttered up.

But way down deep, it all goes back to personal habits of neatness and cleanliness and appreciation of beauty and of order. Do Americans want to admit that the Russians

have these qualities, and the Germans, and the Scandinavians, but they don't? Visit a Soviet subway and you won't find a cigarette butt, not even a discarded candy wrapper. And not a beer can, anywhere. Think about it!

The Tax-Free Racists

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, much of the high-echelon maneuvering behind the rioting, looting, and racial disorder in the United States is attempting to place the blame on the people.

Why do the many "red ribbon" committees and reports seek to blame only "white racism" and fail to even mention the role of the violence financiers—the tax-free foundations and those revolutionists who hide behind fancy titles, emotional slogans, and some who even pose as religious leaders.

The tax-free syndicate boys are buying riots and looting—purchased violence and fear—to further their selfish goals.

No wonder they and their cronies are so quick to shut off reasonable discussion and fair dissent with such lies and smears as bigot, extremist, radical, and racist.

They, and not the American people, are the extremists, fascists, and racists. And they seek to wash their hands of conspiratorial guilt by placing the blame with the law-abiding American taxpayers.

So that our colleagues may know who is paying for the violence in our land, I include the UPI release of April 18 and the Allen-Scott Report of April 19 and other articles:

[From the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, Apr. 18, 1968]

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS NOW AID CIVIL RIGHTS DRIVES

ATLANTA (UPI).—The nation's wealthy, private foundations are beginning to open their pocketbooks more than in the past to finance civil rights programs, including those of some of the militant black power groups. They tend, however, to attach strings to the use of their money.

Led by the Ford Foundation under McGeorge Bundy, the white-controlled philanthropic foundations have funded some direct action programs that a few years ago they would not consider.

Today, foundation money accounts for major portions in the national budgets and plans of several big civil rights and black power groups, ranging from 25 percent of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund's budget to a \$175,000 grant to the militant Congress on Racial Equality (CORE).

"Before Bundy, you couldn't get in at the Ford Foundation to see the time of day," says NAACP's Jack Greenberg, head of the Legal Defense Fund.

SCLC GRANT

Just after the first of the year, the Ford Foundation announced a \$230,000 grant to Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). James Harrison, finance director for SCLC, says it was the first such grant in SCLC's 10 years.

The SCLC grant is for leadership training

of 10 black ministers each in 15 big-city ghettos. They will be taught how to seek federal and state funds and use them in ghetto projects.

It was Ford's fourth major grant to Negro organizations within the last 12 months. In addition to the \$175,000 to the Cleveland CORE chapter for voter registration and youth training, Ford gave \$430,000 to the Urban League and \$300,000 to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), both general support grants to be used at the discretion of the two groups.

Ford also gave a \$47,000 grant to the A. Philip Randolph Institute to train Negroes as apprentices in breaking down craft union discrimination.

GROWING INVOLVEMENT

The Taconic Foundation, the Stern Family Fund, the Field Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation are other big-money foundations with growing involvement in civil rights.

Civil rights and black power groups are pleased with the new source of money and expect it to grow.

"The foundations, even those that were far afield a few years back, are beginning to reshape their thinking to include civil rights," says the Urban League's William R. Simms. "They are doing now what they should have been doing 10 years ago."

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, Apr. 19, 1968]

ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: ROCKY'S RAMROD BACKING POOR PEOPLE'S INVASION (By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Indiana businessman J. Irwin Miller, chairman of the Rockefeller for President Committee, is the rising star to watch on the fast-changing political horizon.

In his new political role, Miller's long-range objectives go far beyond his announced intentions to win the Republican presidential nomination for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

Political associates say that the strategy of Miller, who also has close ties with President Johnson, calls for trying to obtain the presidential nomination for Rockefeller even through a "new party" should the New Yorker fail to capture the major GOP prize.

Miller, the first layman to ascend to the presidency of the politically-powerful National Council of Churches, believes public opinion can be molded and mobilized in such a way as to make anything possible in the field of politics or foreign policy.

One of the key organizers of the 1963 "civil rights" march on Washington, Miller is a long-time champion of using the massive tactics of the late Martin Luther King to change the nation's racial, political, moral, and social landscape.

"Nonviolence tormented the American majority so hard it couldn't stand it," Miller told an interviewer of a national publication. "But when people see violence they are relieved. It lets them off the hook in respect to their own guilt."

Significantly, Miller has given his private backing to the coming "poor people's army" invasion of Washington, which King planned before his assassination and which now is scheduled to take place in mid-May.

PREPARING THE WAY

While Miller, chairman of Cummins Engine Co., of Columbus, Ind., is known for the modern church buildings he has helped to finance, it isn't generally known that he also started his own church.

Following a 1955 break with the Disciples of Christ (former Campbellites) church in which his grandfather once preached, Miller and some friends decided to start a new church which would concentrate on pushing the ecumenical movement.

The new church structure, built in a former cornfield near Columbus, is based on

a hexagonal motif that symbolizes the Star of David.

Critics claim the Bible-quoting Miller, who can read the New Testament in Greek, started the new church to develop a new political religion, which eventually would be closely connected with the United Nations.

Miller is now serving on two important commissions set up by President Johnson. The President reportedly recently told White House aides that after Vice President Hubert Humphrey his choice as a successor would be Gov. Rockefeller.

Both Sens. Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., and Robert Kennedy, D-N.Y., were ranked after Rockefeller by the President, according to a White House insider.

One of the presidential commissions on which Miller is a member is studying the role of big business in rebuilding the slums and the other is about ready to make its report recommending that the Post Office Department be run by a private corporation.

If enacted by Congress, the recommendations of either commission could bring vast changes in the federal government and in the types of social services now provided to the public.

In 1965 Miller served as chairman of a special presidential panel that recommended liberalization of U.S. trade with Communist Russia and Eastern European nations. Those controversial proposals, which were transmitted to Congress by President Johnson, were shelved because of the Vietnam war.

In the 1956 campaign Miller supported and contributed heavily to former President Eisenhower's re-election bid. Later in 1959, Miller and his political allies sought the secretary of commerce position for him, but Eisenhower said no.

Friends say Miller still has his sights trained on a cabinet post and would take one in any liberal administration, regardless of party.

Miller is a registered Republican and close friend of New York Mayor John Lindsay.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 12, 1968]

NEGRO VETERANS GET GRADUATE STUDY AID

PRINCETON, N.J.—The Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation announced yesterday it will provide grants to Negro ex-servicemen to attend graduate schools in government, community organizing, teaching and other public service fields.

The fellowships, named after Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., will be financed initially through a Rockefeller Foundation grant of \$200,000.

Eventually about \$2.5 million will be used to provide about 500 scholarships a year.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 11, 1968]

STUDY COURSE ON KING PRODUCED FOR SCHOOLS (By Ernest Holsendolph)

Officials of the District's Model School Division have obtained an "instant" new curriculum on the late Dr. Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement to be used beginning today.

At the request of Asst. Supt. Norman Nickens, the Educational Development Center in Cambridge, Mass. in two days has compiled and printed four booklets and two tapes on the life of King, the movement and Negro culture.

Yesterday afternoon the material was distributed to the sub-system's 19 schools and 16,500 students, many of whom live in the 14th and 7th Streets riot areas.

In addition, the youngsters were asked to express in writing their reactions to the violence and looting.

Today discussions on the material were to begin with a viewing on educational station WETA of the Public Broadcast Laboratory television special seen last Sunday.

"As educators, we are always searching for

what is relevant to the students," said Nickens, "we can think of nothing that is more meaningful to our students, now than the events of the past week."

Mary Lela Sherburne and her innovation team, which conducts a continuous in-service program for elementary school teachers, on Monday produced a two-page guide to class discussions of King's death, the civil disorder and the significance of the events.

In an introduction to the guide, Nickens wrote: "In times of crisis children learn rapidly; therefore make use of the events of the weekend to help them learn."

"Do not fail them by lecturing when they need to talk," he concluded.

"The new material was needed to help the children—they were confused and frightened by all the events," Mrs. Sherburne said.

"We feel we have a job to do, to bring about a sense of stability and then to begin the task of building self-respect among the children," she continued.

Included in the material compiled for the model schools are pictures of King and his wife and children. There are stories about King's youth, when he was just 4 years old and already aware and very resentful of segregation.

In one instance young Martin was deprived of two favorite playmates, both white, when the white parents decided the boys were becoming too fond of one another.

In another episode King tells of the day he and his father walked out of a shoe store when the shop owner ordered them to sit in the back of the store until white customers were served.

Peter Dow, director of the social studies project in Cambridge, said the quick work was a "first" for his organization.

"We ordinarily take up to three years to study a curriculum idea before moving," he said.

He said his organization is at work on long-range curriculum program relevant to inner-city children, but that the emergency work had been done at the request of the District.

The project cost about \$15,000, with about two-thirds of the cost defrayed by the Eugene and Agnes Meyer Foundation of Washington.

From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 18, 1968]

UNIVERSITY OK'S RIGHTS WORK PLAN

STORRS, CONN.—Trustees of the University of Connecticut have voted to free up to 25 of its faculty members each semester to work full-time in civil rights programs.

The trustees' action yesterday, expected to cost the university about \$150,000 each semester, was described by University President Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. as "unique in this country."

Also included in a plan approved by the administrators was a proposal to set up a university council charged with recommending specific civil rights programs and policies for the 15,000-student university system.

The board's vote coincided with the climax of a drive on and near the main campus during which 1,100 signatures were collected on a petition urging "quick and visible progress" in eradicating "white racist attitudes" within the university community.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

BRANDO TO DEVOTE TIME TO CIVIL RIGHTS

HOLLYWOOD.—Actor Marlon Brando, stepping out of starring roles in two motion pictures, says he will devote his full energies to civil rights.

The announcement came four days after Brando appeared at the Oakland (Calif.) funeral of Bobby Hutton, 17, a militant Black Panther killed in a gun battle.

Until recently, Brando was set for starring roles in Ella Kazan's "The Arrangement" and a Western, "Sundance Kid and Butch Cassidy." But the actor said yesterday, "There

are issues facing us with which I think everyone ought to concern himself first and foremost. I don't feel that I can do two things successfully at one time."

A spokesman for Warner Bros.-Seven Arts, where "The Arrangement" will be filmed, said Brando was "devastated" by the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

[From the Washington Post]

WILL THE U.N. TAKE OVER NEW YORK?

Secretary General U Thant has met with Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City, Arthur Goldberg, United States ambassador to the United Nations, and representatives of the Ford Foundation to discuss the need for expanding U.N. office space. He has his eye on a collection of tracts owned by the city and Consolidated Edison just off the U.N. boundaries.

More space is needed for U.N. agencies and the secretariat, Thant said, tho it already has a skyscraper secretariat, a conference building, and a general assembly building.

The U.N. is fulfilling the law which decrees that bureaucracies expand in inverse proportion to constructive work accomplished. With a good deal more space, the U.N. should be able to get even less done.

Human Rights Year and the European Nations

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1948 a historic document came into being that expresses man's deepest belief about the rights with which every human being is born with and which no government is entitled to deny. This document is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations.

To implement the objectives of this Declaration, the United Nations has designated 1968 as International Human Rights Year and has invited all of its member countries to make intensive efforts to realize the aims of the Declaration.

On October 11, 1967, President Johnson issued a proclamation designating 1968 as Human Rights Year and called upon all Americans and all government agencies—Federal, State, and local—to "use this occasion to deepen our commitment to the defense of human rights and to strengthen our efforts for their full and effective realization both among our own people and among all the peoples of the United Nations."

International human rights can be compared to the civil rights movement within the United States. Each is based upon the dignity of man to maintain his own freedom as guaranteed by the laws of the land. While we endeavor to provide this dignity to our American citizens, the European nations are still determined to curtail the self-determination of their own citizens.

On the occasion of this International Human Rights Year, the Assembly of Captive European Nations has issued a memorandum calling for all humanity to grant these God given human rights to

those who are still under the control of alien governments.

Mr. Speaker, because of the timeliness of this memorandum, I would like to incorporate its text as part of my remarks and bring the observations of the Assembly of Captive European Nations to the attentions of my colleagues in this honorable body. I feel certain that the objectives outlined in this memorandum will meet with the approval of all just people who desire to see equality of mankind throughout the world.

The memorandum follows:

[A Memorandum from the Assembly of Captive European Nations]

HUMAN RIGHTS AND A EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT

In these days of swift historic changes, the problem of Europe has become submerged by crises and complex issues in other parts of the world. It has, however, been the firm belief of the Assembly of Captive European Nations that a general relaxation of world tension is incumbent upon a Europe united in freedom. A Europe cleft in two would continue to generate perennial strife and contention hardly conducive to achieving the over-all objective of binding Europe's wounds and "making it whole again." It is unlikely that workable long-range solutions to the world-wide conflicts can be found and implemented until the problem of Europe finds a satisfactory solution.

Yet the quest for "normalizing" the situation in Europe is confronted with a number of endemic problems. A Europe divided and composed, side by side, of legitimate governments and of regimes ruling by force alone would know no lasting peace. Genuine stability and respect for human rights can be achieved only when all the members of the European family of nations are represented by freely elected governments which deal with one another in mutual respect and not from fear. The situation in Europe would not be "normalized" by recognizing the *status quo*. Such a move would defeat the very object of trying to foster a valid European settlement and would inject into European developments an element of permanent uncertainty.

There are, however, currently available options, which could help stimulate change and lead to a Europe reflecting the basic needs and aspirations of all the people in the area.

A key to a Europe based on respect for human rights is self-determination. One of the major forces shaping the events of our time, self-determination allows a people to decide under what type of domestic institutions they desire to live and what alliances they wish to enter into. A country free to shape its own destiny and exercising full national sovereignty represents a component of stability on which a larger regional grouping can be built. Conversely, a nation deprived of its rights to charter its future and prisoner of an unpopular self-perpetuating system is a constant source of internal ferment and upheavals.

In ACEN's view, it is therefore deemed essential that an integrated Europe be built on and around the principle of self-determination. As self-determination is an integral part of fundamental human rights, observance of these rights would generate a climate in which the rule of law would take precedence to force and vested interests.

The year 1968, proclaimed Human Rights Year by the United Nations as well as by the President of the United States, offers fresh opportunities for helping foster fundamental human rights in East-Central Europe and thus bring closer the day when the peoples of East-Central Europe will again sit together as equals with the other nations of Europe.

THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

The International Year for Human Rights opens up new vistas for a closer look at the pressing problem of fundamental human rights in East-Central Europe and for a timely initiative to make the implementation of these rights an objective of Western policy.

Key meetings on human rights scheduled for 1968 provide a ready forum for such an initiative by the West. There is the United Nations Conference on Human Rights, to be held April 22-May 13, in Teheran, Iran, followed later in the year by special meetings of the Council of Europe and other international bodies. The United Nations calendar on observances of the Twentieth Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights also indicates heightened interest in a just and impartial application of the rights of man to people in all parts of the world.

Any Western initiative in bringing the issue of human rights in East-Central Europe to international attention would be amply justified on both moral and legal grounds.

Under the United Nations Charter, all member states "pledge themselves to take joint and separate action" to promote "Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all..."

These fundamental human rights were systematically clarified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the U.N. General Assembly on December 10, 1948. By voting for the Declaration all member states in effect assumed collective and individual responsibility to help safeguard man's inherent right to freedom, dignity, and equal justice.

That human rights and fundamental freedoms including the sovereign right of each nation to live under a system of government of its own choosing is succinctly set forth in Article 21 of the Universal Declaration, which says:

(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

In the debates in the United Nations on the Covenants of Human Rights, the right to self-determination has often been called the foundation on which all other rights rest; if self-determination is denied, no other right is secure.

Yet as 1968 ushers in the Twentieth Anniversary of the Universal Declaration, suppression of free speech, free press, and free assembly reflects the continued contempt of the Communist regimes for the rights of East-Central Europe's 100 million people. At the same time, recent developments in East-Central Europe indicate that the time is propitious for assisting the people in their quest for the restoration of their basic rights and freedoms.

The Communist system is confronted with built-in problems and deep-seated strains. Czechoslovakia has recently become the scene of a vigorous vocal protest against the regime's repressive policies. The struggle for liberalization reached a climatic moment at the stormy Fourth Congress of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union held in Prague at the end of June, 1967. Some authors sharply condemned the Party's domestic and foreign policy, its interference in the internal affairs of the Union, curtailment of the freedom of opinion, and strict censorship. Party leadership responded with swift retaliatory measures. In Poland the growing opposition of the intellectuals to the regime has been brought into sharp focus in recent court trials of writers and university professors, and by

mass students demonstrations against censorship of literary works. The Warsaw demonstration of February 5, 1968 resulted in 50 arrests.

These and similar developments throughout the Communist orbit mirror the urgent need and rising demand for freedom of thought and expression, denied by the regimes to the intellectuals and other citizens alike. It is significant that although the intellectuals remain economically dependent on the regime's favor and caprice, they dare question the official ideology. Moreover, they are furnishing the masses with a "consciousness" of injustice—a crucial motivating force of change.

The intellectuals in the captive countries must be made aware that their humanist protest is supported by the free world. It is therefore deemed essential that the plight of the intellectuals—who also speak for the peasants and the workers—be fully aired at meetings and conferences held in conjunction with the International Year for Human Rights.

The growing demand for economic expertise has given rise in East-Central Europe to social groups whose professional interests conflict with those of the Communist elite. Technological progress has often been known to undermine the sociopolitical position of the groups in power. Recent developments in East-Central Europe have shown that a regimented political system, such as the Communist state, is increasingly hard put to adjust itself to the demands of the dynamics of change. Since the Communist state apparatus has failed to make substantive changes within its existing institutions, the new conditions attendant on economic expansion are placing severe strains on an apparatus evolved from a rigid ideological order.

With the gradual departure of the "Old Guard" and the advent of a new generation of more pragmatic East-Central Europeans, the lever of Western economic superiority could be used more effectively than ever before. In helping stimulate the trend toward change, however, it should be made clear that the intent and objective of Western policy is to provide assistance to the East-Central European peoples and not to the Communist regimes as such.

APPEAL FOR WESTERN ACTION

The fate of East-Central Europe, and its inevitable impact on European and international developments, is of vital interest to the free world. If the East-Central European peoples remain confident in the restoration of their fundamental human rights, they will continue pressing with renewed vigor for further change and liberalization. To help maintain their morale, it is essential to bring their plight to full-scale international attention at appropriate world forums.

For the past 14 years, the United Nations Human Rights Commission has addressed itself to the task of preparing covenants that would transform the Universal Declaration into a binding convention and endow it with the proper machinery to insure the implementation and enforcement of human rights.

In the absence of operative United Nations covenants, it is of special importance that the free world continue to exert its political and moral influence on behalf of the East-Central European peoples.

The International Year for Human Rights provides a ready opportunity to raise the issue of the denial of self-determination and the violation of fundamental human rights of the 100 million people of East-Central Europe.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations therefore appeals to the free nations of the world:

(a) To raise the question of the implementation of human rights in East-Central Europe at the United Nations Conference on Human Rights in Teheran, and at all

meetings and commemorative assemblies held in conjunction with the observance of Twentieth Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(b) To use every opportunity to press the Soviet Union and the Communist regimes of East-Central Europe to restore to the peoples of these countries the full enjoyment of the rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Universal Declaration;

(c) To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national sovereignty and individual freedom and dignity;

(d) To help foster a positive program aimed at the integration of a Europe composed of free sovereign nations, represented by freely elected governments responsible to the will of the people.

The Grade School Dropout Who Made Good

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the very inspiring story of a very unusual man in my congressional district.

This gentleman is Ted F. Kuckelman, who retired recently for the third time, at the ripe age of 79, and who has already accepted a new position.

Mr. Kuckelman, who will be 80 years old on July 18, retired last month as executive director of the Westland Chamber of Commerce, which he organized 5 years ago. Last week, he accepted appointment as executive secretary of the Belleville Area Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Kuckelman first retired at the age of 67, after a long and successful career in sales work. He then became executive secretary of the Wayne Chamber of Commerce, and retired from that position after 7 years, at the age of 74.

A most excellent synopsis of Mr. Kuckelman's fascinating life appeared recently in the Associated Newspapers, under the byline of Joyce Hagelthorn, who interviewed him after his retirement. A few weeks later, an article in the Belleville Enterprise Roman announced his appointment to the Belleville job.

I include both articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a fitting tribute to my candidate for "Mr. Senior Citizen of 1968".

THE GRADE SCHOOL DROPOUT WHO MADE GOOD:
TED KUCKELMAN, 80, GOING ON 39, IS STILL
PACE SETTER FOR ENTHUSIASM AND EX-
AMPLE

(By Joyce Hagelthorn)

For a grade school dropout, Belleville's Ted Kuckelman has done right well for himself. Almost everyone has written about the Westland Chamber of Commerce executive director, he said, but no one has ever written that Ted Kuckelman is really a grade school dropout, and a third-grade dropout to boot. The almost eighty year old man that no

one can keep retired is rather proud of his scholastic career, "because it kind of bears out the truth in that story of Abe Lincoln." With his famous laugh that turns his face into that of a mischievous boy, he said Lincoln's fame wasn't necessarily due to his being born in a cabin, but that he left that cabin.

It all began on July 18, 1888, when Ted Kuckelman was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, a town that saw little of him, for he was destined to grow up on a farm in Kansas. He was the first of nine children.

"Talk about being raised," he said proudly, "I was raised in a really strict home. My mother was the boss. My dad used to get a little hot under the collar but my mother was the cucumber. She was a planner. She'd fix it so we kids had a job to do every day . . . a different one. If we set the table one night, then someone else would do it the next night. You know we didn't have silverware . . . we had knives and forks."

Young Ted started to school like everyone when he was about six years old. He attended a little country school which was about two miles from his home.

"That school sat on about an acre of land," Kuckelman reminisced. "On opposite corners of that acre of land stood a couple of little houses and when you had to go out to one of those little houses you raised your hand," he grinned.

The school was heated with an old pot-bellied stove that could get hotter than blazes, he said, and on the darkish days the gloom was lifted by coal oil lamps.

"We only went to school in the winter time when you couldn't farm," he noted. "All of the boys who lived on farms had to help out their dad, and the girls had to help cook and clean in the house."

"You know," he continued, "every kid grows up with a hero. Next to their dad they've got to have someone they admire more than anyone . . . some man. Well, I got to the third grade and that is when I met mine. I learned more from that third grade teacher than I had learned in the two years previous, and he made me want to keep on learning all of my life. I really thought he was something."

The next year, however, found Kuckelman's father in ill health and the very young boy had to drop out of school to help keep the farm going.

"I don't remember it as being so bad," he said. "I had learned to love to read, and after I would get through with my work I would literally devour any book I could get my hands on. I've always been a voracious reader, and as I grew older, I used to always suggest that when someone wanted to meet me somewhere, he should meet me at the library. That way I could sit and read for a spell if he were late."

The boy grew into young manhood and married his childhood sweetheart when he was twenty-three.

"Five days after we were married, I suddenly woke up," Kuckelman said. "I sat up as if something had exploded in my head . . . and on that day my life changed completely. I knew that I didn't want to spend the rest of my life farming. I knew there had to be something better . . . something different. And I wanted it. So I kissed my bride goodbye for a while, and I climbed aboard a little train and went to Kansas City where I got a job with the B. F. Goodrich Company."

"I guess that was the first instance of selling myself, because they gave this farm boy a job. First I had to take training, and then they sent me out on the territory where I learned how to sell, and pretty soon they transferred me to Denver."

Kuckelman leaned back in his tiltback chair in the Westland Chamber of Commerce office and looked up at the citations and awards adorning one complete wall.

"Do you realize," he asked, "that I had never even seen a car until I was seventeen,

but I knew, I knew there was something wonderful out there in the world just waiting for me."

From Denver he was sent to Toledo and in the next few years he made almost every major city in the United States. And he was successful.

He had one son, Walter, who now lives in Birmingham, Mich., and Kuckelman is the grandfather to two and the great grandfather to three.

It was sometime during his many transfers that Kuckelman realized his need for additional schooling. He enrolled in the Dale Carnegie Institute, where he became imbued with the Carnegie philosophy and using it as a firm foundation, built his own on more expansive terms.

"You can't be successful," Kuckelman related, "unless you love your job. Actually, you can't be successful in any walk of life unless you love. Do you know what love means?" he asked as he swiveled around in his chair and without waiting for an answer, continued, "love means to sacrifice. Love means giving . . . giving until it hurts, whether it is in your work, or your daily life. If you love your work then you are bound to be enthusiastic. After enthusiasm comes truth."

"You know," he waved his pencil above his desk, "no deal is a good deal unless both parties benefit. If you make a deal and you get three fourths of the benefits then you have nothing to crow about. You've lost."

When Kuckelman finally retired from the sales work he loved, it was only by coercion. "They caught up with me," he grinned. There I was sixty-seven years old when the company had a merger—which is actually organized confusion—and in that confusion someone happened to look down a list and saw that I was 67 years old. They made me retire."

He didn't retire for very long, however. It was immediately after his forced retirement that he became the Executive Secretary of the Wayne Community Chamber of Commerce where he served for 8½ years. It was during this time he lost his wife, and for three months he wandered around Kansas and Nebraska just sort of visiting around."

Upon his return he took up his mantle as a dedicated volunteer. The list of organizations he belongs to is a prepossessing one, but almost too lengthy for a weekly paper to publish. In each organization he has successfully served in an official capacity.

He is extremely proud of his honorary life membership in the Knights of Columbus and in the Elks Lodge. This membership was the first life membership issued for the Plymouth Lodge No. 1785.

"You have to be pretty old and have joined pretty young to get that one," he grinned.

It was shortly after his return from Nebraska that Kuckelman organized the Nankin Chamber of Commerce in February 1963.

Kuckelman believes all problems that descend on man are of his own making, in some form or other.

"Whenever you violate the rules of nature, you are in trouble," he said. "Even though you may not even be aware you are violating them. It's important to spend a lot of time studying and determining what those laws are, and then make sure you live by them."

"You know," he said thoughtfully, "everything starts with you. Each morning when you get up you should look in the mirror and say to the face looking back at you, 'If it's to be, it's up to me.' It's a great slogan, and it works every time if you really believe it."

"You've got to remember and always be aware that whatever happens to you is your own doing. The objectives you have make you. I've always claimed that if you want something bad enough and hard and long enough you will get it."

And Ted Kuckelman, dearly loved, highly

respected, dedicated volunteer and successful businessman has shown that being a grade school dropout doesn't necessarily have to defeat one. Probably because he wanted something bad enough and hard enough and long enough . . . and he got it.

BELLEVILLE CHAMBER APPOINTS KUCKELMAN

BELLEVILLE.—Ted F. Kuckelman, a dedicated community leader and successful businessman and organizer, has been appointed Executive Secretary of the Belleville Area Chamber of Commerce.

The appointment of Kuckelman, long-time resident of Belleville, was announced by Justin Emerson, president of the Chamber of Commerce.

He succeeds Merrill R. Bird, who submitted his resignation last February, effective April 1, after five years at the helm of the Chamber.

Kuckelman, who has twice retired during lifetime from successful ventures, will be 80 years old on July 14.

His love for fellowman and especially his adopted community (Belleville) prompted him to again busy himself with the affairs relating to the well being and future of his fellow citizens and business leaders.

Born in Cincinnati, Ohio on July 14, 1888, Kuckelman has held a variety of roles throughout the United States. In each he has brought improvement and happiness to people and areas that he has served.

He recently retired (March 30) as executive secretary and organizer of the Westland Chamber of Commerce.

A banquet honoring Kuckelman, known as "Mr. Western Wayne County," will be held April 30 at the Wayne-Ford Civic League Hall, located on Ford Road in Westland. The dinner is a testimonial in recognition and appreciation for his many untiring efforts at the helm of the Westland Chamber.

He is an internationally known Rotarian and one of its leading speakers and boosters.

Kuckelman was also the organizer of the Wayne Chamber of Commerce. His list of organizational accomplishments would fill many pages.

And now, when most men of his age definitely retire, Ted Kuckelman's unceasing desire to be of some use to those around, he has consented to accept the post of the Belleville Chamber of Commerce.

The Chamber office is now located in the Professional Building, 150 Main Street. Residents and merchants are asked to drop in and meet and welcome "Ted."

Fly on Your Own

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the problem with the balance of payments is painfully familiar to us all and probably has been one of the most frequently discussed subjects on this floor as of late. We can scarcely pick up a newspaper these days or listen to a news broadcast which does not touch on the problem in some way. As we have more problems than we really need these days, it is nice to come across solutions even if they only partially alleviate the situation.

One obvious way in which Americans can help swing the balance of payments in our favor is to fly American air carriers whenever possible. We are a generous nation by nature and tend sometimes to be rather apologetic about self-

serving methods but why should not our people use our own carriers? They are, after all, the finest and most experienced in the world.

There is a very commendable editorial on this subject published recently in the Washington Daily News. I recommend it to this body and include it in the RECORD:

FLY ON OUR OWN

United States airlines flying overseas are putting on quite a campaign to convince American travelers that, if at all possible, they should use a U.S.-flag airline.

Self-serving? Yes. But also an argument that today definitely is in our country's best interests considering the woeful deficit in our balance of international payments.

The statistics on air travel to and from Europe are most interesting. Fifty-one per cent of U.S. citizens flying the North Atlantic do so on foreign airlines, but only 29 per cent of Europeans flying to or from the U.S. use American carriers. And American citizens represent 63 per cent of the travelers.

Almost all the foreign airlines are owned by their governments and the records show startlingly high usage by nationals of their flag carriers. For example, on travel to the U.S., 76.3 per cent of the Belgians coming over use their air carriers, 75.5 per cent of the French, 84.5 per cent of the Swedes, 91.1 per cent of the Dutch, and so on. The per cent of usage of their airlines by other nationals is comparably high.

Some foreign airlines have pointed out that by purchase of U.S.-manufactured planes they have poured more money into the U.S. than they have taken out thru fares from U.S. travelers. And that likely is true in some instances.

But today the U.S. is in a real crisis in its balance-of-payments situation. And any device or practice possible that can keep an extra dollar at home must be used.

Such, it seems to us, is the case now as to what airline to use, if you must go abroad. It is estimated that two-thirds of your money spent for a ticket on a U.S.-flag airline stays at home while, for a foreign-flag airline, two-thirds of it goes abroad.

Americans can start becoming less nationalistic about a lot of things, including foreign air travel, once again when, and if, our international payments are brought into balance.

Unemployment Compensation Resolution

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 1229 which provides for emergency funding of unemployment compensation benefits to our ex-servicemen and Federal employees.

A number of returning veterans from my congressional district have experienced difficulty in receiving their weekly compensation checks to which they are justly entitled, and which are so necessary to help, in the transition period from military to civilian status.

I hope the Senate will act on this matter expeditiously so that no further delays may be encountered. The adoption of this resolution should alleviate the difficulties being experienced by many individuals who must depend upon these moneys for proper sustenance.

Las Vegas Send 30 Tons of Soap To South Vietnam

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to inform my colleagues that Las Vegas, Nev., has achieved another first. Not only for the city, or the State of Nevada, but a first for the whole Nation.

I have been informed by the committee in charge of Operation Soapbar that some 30 tons of bar soap have been shipped to South Vietnam to make life a little more bearable for its citizens.

Operation Soapbar was a Las Vegas community project coordinated by local citizens through the Marine Corps civic action program in which each citizen of Las Vegas was asked to donate a bar of soap.

The purpose of Operation Soapbar was humanitarian—that the people of South Vietnam may raise their health standards, and ultimately be able to educate and protect themselves from Communist aggression.

Probably the most significant feature of Operation Soapbar was the fact that it was carried off with no financial aid from any source. All labor, equipment, and professional services were donated.

When the project began, the area literally blossomed with soap collecting gimmicks. Collection barrels were distributed countywide.

One businessman matched all donations that came through his doors. A movie theater made the admission to a matinee a bar of soap. A gas station, beauty parlor, and carwash offered services for a bar of soap. Donations of soap from local hotels and motels could be measured only in hundreds of pounds. Local news media and advertising groups kept Operation Soapbar before the southern Nevada public constantly.

Billboards were erected. Sixty thousand schoolchildren participated in a school soap drive. A vacant office was offered to store the enormous collection of soap. Each supermarket kicked off its collection barrel with a case of soap from its own stock. Businesses with as few as 10 employees held drives. City employees, firemen, and policemen conducted their drives for a contribution. A local photography studio always had someone at hand to "shoot" the various events.

This and much, much more was done by the "different" citizens of Las Vegas, Nev.

The logistics of moving this amount of soap to its destination was a project almost as big as the actual collections. A local moving and storage group furnished the boxes and trucks needed to package the soap for hauling to San Diego. A local airline also helped transport the soap.

The Navy's Project Handclasp took charge of the soap in San Diego for shipment to Vietnam where it will be given to marines for distribution among the citizens of South Vietnam.

No less enthusiastic were the Marine Corps leaders involved in Operation

Soapbar. When in town to thank Las Vegas personally, Maj. Gen. Lowell E. English, commanding general at MCRD, San Diego, said:

It is amazing the way the community here has responded . . . truly a tremendous effort.

Col. Donald R. Kennedy, director of the 12th Marine Corps District, San Francisco, and originator of Operation Soapbar, who was here with General English, and echoed the general's praise.

A letter from Mayor Oran K. Gragson and a copy of the Las Vegas Sun newspaper with Operation Soapbar headlines has been enclosed in each box of soap destined for South Vietnam. The letter said in part:

Sending soap to you is a very small way in which we thought we could help you (Marines) with your Civic Action Program. I'm sure it would please you to know that the citizens of our city in every walk of life and of all ages contributed toward this drive as a token of their appreciation for what you are doing for our country.

We sincerely hope that our contribution will make your job easier and will aid the Vietnamese people in their fight against the malignant growth of communism which threatens to engulf them.

Thanks, take care and hurry home!

Miss Martha Dawson Is Winner in Search for Homemaker of Tomorrow

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, Miss Martha Dawson, of Southside High School, Gadsden, Ala., which is in my congressional district, has been chosen as the Betty Crocker Homemaker of Tomorrow for Alabama.

The Betty Crocker search for the American homemaker of tomorrow is now in its 14th year. The search is designed to assist schools in their essential work of inspiring the Nation's young women with a deeper awareness and understanding of the place of the American home in our society, and to enhance the prestige of homemaking as a career.

This year, 600,000 senior girls in 15,000 high schools throughout the United States participated in the Betty Crocker search program. Every State winner receives a \$1,500 scholarship plus an educational tour of Washington, D.C., Colonial Williamsburg, Va., and Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Speaker, these young homemakers are dedicating their efforts and energy to a most vital segment of American life. They exemplify the basic principles and goals of family life. It is with a great deal of personal pride and satisfaction that I congratulate all of these State winners in this competition, and especially Miss Dawson.

Their work is often lost in the maze of activities that are sometimes considered more important and more timely. Thus, it is, I believe, very appropriate that we set aside some time to pay tribute to these young people who are enriching home life in America and working tirelessly in one of our most important occupations—homemaking.

Television That Lingers in the Mind After the Switch Has Been Clicked Off

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, someone has been quoted as saying that the wide variety of programing offered to WQED viewers has resulted in "television that lingers in the mind after the switch has been clicked off."

Proof of the validity of this statement, and of the ever-growing awareness that Americans are beginning to recognize educational television for what it has strived to become—an invaluable national resource—is the fact that the largest educational institution in western Pennsylvania, measured by the number of students it reaches, is WQED, the Nation's first community educational television station, in Pittsburgh, Pa. It is estimated that 960,000 student viewers will have been exposed to its televised courses this year in programs which range from languages and concerts to studies of other peoples of the world and current events. This is triple the number of 5 years ago.

A special supplement of the Pittsburgh Press of April 14 carried an interesting story on the growth and effectiveness of classroom TV, which I commend to my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

CLASSROOM TV—960,000 STUDENT VIEWERS

(By Ken Eskey)

Name the largest educational institution in Western Pennsylvania.

Pittsburgh public schools?

Allegheny County schools?

Catholic schools in the Pittsburgh Diocese? University of Pittsburgh?

The answer—as they say in the multiple choice tests—is none of the above.

The largest educational institution in Western Pennsylvania, measured by the number of students it reaches, is a blackened stone mansion in Oakland known as educational television station WQED.

Instructional TV beamed courses into more than 27,000 classrooms in 17 counties this year, penetrating as far north as Pymatuning and as far south as the hill country of Marion County, W. Va.

An estimated 960,000 student viewers will have been exposed to televised courses during the program year ending May 17.

The number of student viewers has tripled in the past five years and should pass the million mark in 1968-69.

This means a million viewers, not a million students. A student is counted twice if he takes two TV courses, three times if he takes three TV courses.

The Pittsburgh public schools, for example, had about 111,500 viewers last fall. Yet only 41,000 of the 76,000 students were watching WQED (Channel 13) or the ultra-high frequency WQEX (Channel 16).

Elementary viewers outnumbered secondary viewers 10 to one, partly because of this duplication and partly because of TV scheduling difficulties at the high school level.

Scheduling remains the chief irritant of classroom TV.

Courses are offered five days a week between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. to coincide roughly with school hours, but no two school systems use exactly the same timetable.

A high school French program that starts at 10:40 a.m. may suit one school district but not another, even if it's repeated at 1:45 p.m. the next day.

And a teacher may be reluctant to use TV if only one of his four French classes happens to meet during a program period.

Closed circuit television within a school system may be the ultimate solution to the scheduling problem.

Richard H. Barnes, the liaison man between WQED and the schools, says this would enable schools to tape programs and repeat them at suitable times.

Mr. Barnes, who spent eight years with the pioneer team teaching project at Lexington, Mass., shows teachers how to use classroom TV and tries to talk skeptical administrators into televised instruction.

"Administrators say the teachers aren't interested and teachers say the administrators aren't interested," he said.

Eighty-six school systems signed up for the service this year, 31 of them in Allegheny County, 12 in Beaver County, eight in Mercer County and the rest scattered through Western Pennsylvania, six counties in West Virginia and one in Ohio.

It costs a school district \$1 per pupil per year to participate.

A district may contract for elementary services, secondary services or both. Pittsburgh takes both and pays about \$70,000 a year, thereby providing almost one-third of the station's annual instructional budget.

All 112 City schools use classroom television, some more than others. About 54 per cent of the students and 36 per cent of the teachers take part.

More than 170 parochial schools in the WQED signal area use classroom TV.

Despite its increasing popularity, the instructional program does not support itself financially. The deficit was about \$38,000 in 1966-67, according to Rhea Sikes, director of school services at WQED.

"Bootlegging"—using classroom TV without paying for it—is still a problem to the station.

But the schools that just turn on the TV set without sending in the money normally don't have access to WQED's study materials and teacher training services.

Miss Sikes believes teachers have accepted TV as a helper, not a competitor.

"It doesn't use them. They use it," she said.

Classroom television has its critics, of course. Two visitors from the Council for Basic Education commented recently that the TV programs used for large groups in the City schools "seemed to us fairly pedestrian."

Miss Sikes points out that classroom programs are developed by educators, not by television people like herself.

WQED has a 16-member School Curriculum Advisory Committee, headed by Charles Hettinger, director of television and radio education for the City schools.

Most of the committee members are school superintendents or instructional specialists from the districts served by the station.

Twenty-seven classroom courses will be offered next fall, including new ones in creative dramatics (primary), study trips (intermediate) and physics (upper elementary).

Among the most popular programs are the fourth, fifth and sixth grade science courses taught by Francis Alder of the Keystone Oaks schools.

At one time Mr. Alder was assigned to the WQED staff. Now, because of video tape, his lectures can be shown while he works elsewhere.

Other popular programs are "Tell Me a Story" and "Talking Town," both of which were developed by Pittsburgh teachers for primary children, and "Demand Performance," a series of 15-minute films with commentary by Mr. Hettinger.

Maxine Jones, a City teacher, attached to WQED, teaches "News 68," a current events program.

Miss Jones and Mr. Hettinger both work full-time on TV. They receive their regular

salaries, plus 10 per cent as television teachers.

Other local teachers seen on classroom TV are Robert Honse of Chartiers Valley and Mary Alice Miklancie and Robert Berkebile of the City system.

Mr. Berkebile's linguistic courses for freshmen and sophomores are offered on WQED under a special arrangement with the Pittsburgh Board of Education.

Many of the WQED courses were developed by educational stations in other parts of the country.

Contrary to the popular notion, Mrs. Patty Hughes' kindergarten programs are not part of classroom TV, nor are the "Misterogers" programs of Fred Rogers.

They are beamed at children in homes rather than at children in schools.

The effectiveness of classroom television is hard to measure, but Miss Sikes says the feedback was favorable from a questionnaire sent to teachers last fall by Mr. Hettinger.

The key to success, she believes, is the skill of the classroom teacher in adapting the TV lesson to her students.

A teacher in Beaver wrote to Mr. Hettinger last fall about her class of 11 handicapped pupils, some able to do second grade work, others able to tackle junior high courses, all of them enthusiastic about WQED.

"We try to strike a balance and do a good deal of adapting," she wrote. "Sometimes what they absorb is surprising."

GROWTH OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS IN USAGE OF WQED-WQEX SCHOOL SERVICES

Year	Coun- ties	School systems	Schools	Class- rooms	Viewers
1962-63	10	68	549	9,330	326,550
1963-64	13	73	541	13,626	476,910
1964-65	16	80	537	15,438	540,330
1965-66	17	80	683	17,838	624,330
1966-67	18	78	720	23,359	817,565
1967-68	17	86	735	27,416	959,560

Aberdeen Major Dies in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Ralph C. Wight, Jr., a fine soldier from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

ABERDEEN MAJOR DIES IN VIETNAM: RALPH C. WIGHT, JR., WAS WOUNDED NEAR LONG BINH

An Army major from Aberdeen, Md., was fatally wounded in Vietnam April 6 when an anti-tank round struck a jeep in which he was riding near Long Binh, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Killed was Maj. Ralph C. Wight, Jr., of 361 Roberts way. He was 35 years old.

Mrs. Marianne Wight, the officer's wife, said her husband had been executive officer of the 185th Maintenance Battalion since November 14, 1967, when he arrived in Vietnam.

"He was counting the days till he could come home," she said.

Major Wight was born in Newton, Mass., and graduated from the University of Vermont.

ORDNANCE SPECIALIST

An assignment to Aberdeen Proving Ground brought him to Maryland in 1966. He was an ordnance specialist.

Besides his wife, the major is survived by a son, Michael Thomas, 8; a daughter, Karen Anne, 5; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph C. Wight, Sr., of Pittsfield, N.H., and three sis-

ters, Julia Anne Wight, of Newton Falls, Mass., Barbara L. Wight, of Salem, Mass., and Mrs. John P. Wellington, of Mansfield, Mass.

Builder-Burner

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, informed Americans chuckled at the announcement of Whitney Young, Jr., titular head of the National Urban League, a member of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, and the recent race riot commission who proclaims he is now grown up to be a "black power militant."

Of course, in identifying himself to the black revolutionists as one of the tribe he cushions the blow to his many white liberal friends by adding he is a builder, not a burner.

Mayhops what he means is that he builds the organization and his stooges do the burning—nonviolent burning, that is. All of which labels Young as a builder-burner. Any question why the Commission reports can only find "white racism" for a tear-jerking scapegoat?

Must be a lot of builder-burner money available when the league can hire John Gardner and Peter Libassi away from HEW.

I include the Evening Star releases for April 9 and April 20, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 9, 1968]

YOUNG SAYS HE'S A MILITANT AS BUILDER, NOT BURNER

Whitney Young Jr., head of the National Urban League, labeled himself a "black power militant" yesterday, then immediately drew a distinction between "the builders and the burners."

He said he has reached the point where he "isn't remotely concerned with how white people feel or how sorry they are. I'm only concerned about how white people act."

He expressed belief that Americans "should no longer talk about Negro or white leadership but about American leadership," the kind of leadership representing "decent thinking people."

Generally labeled a moderate, Young displayed evidence of the pressures currently pulling at Negro moderates following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King and Negro uprisings in dozens of cities.

GARDNER ASKS ACTION

He was in Washington with John W. Gardner and other leaders of the National Urban Coalition, an urban lobby of business, labor, religious and civil rights leaders that has been organized in 33 cities, including Washington.

At a press conference, Gardner, who became president of the coalition after he resigned as secretary of health, education and welfare, read a statement saying the nation owes to the memory of King and to itself immediate action on the "crises confronting our cities."

The executive committee statement called on Congress to remain in session until it acts on a wide variety of legislation, particularly a civil rights bill and a \$279 million poverty supplemental fund bill.

Meanwhile, Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield said Congress should not act hastily and that it might withhold action on all but an open-housing bill until after

an Easter recess scheduled to begin Thursday and end April 17.

YOUNG GIVES VIEWS

The coalition's statement urged adoption of a tax increase and "a specific reordering of national priorities, rather than across-the-board cuts of federal expenditures without regard to need or merit."

After the statement members of the committee were questioned by reporters.

Young—perhaps the most obviously on edge over recent events—said he has received numerous expressions of sympathy over King's death, but such tributes "are not transferable to the ghetto."

Asked where national Negro leaders go from here, he said:

"This is all in a fluid state. We are all reassessing, re-examining our own organizational thrusts as well as our efforts to cooperate with others."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 20, 1968]

RIGHTS CHIEF AT HEW JOINING URBAN COALITION

(By Barbara Kober)

F. Peter Libassi has resigned as director of Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

He will be replaced by Mrs. Ruby G. Martin, 35, who will become special assistant to the secretary in charge of civil rights activities, it was announced yesterday.

Libassi will join the executive staff of the Urban Coalition, the non-governmental agency headed by former HEW Secretary John W. Gardner.

The changes become effective May 1.

Mrs. Martin, now Director of Operations in the HEW Civil Rights Office, will be in charge of all the department's compliance activities under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits federal financial aid to activities which practice racial discrimination.

As a staff member of the organization which deals with problems of the cities, Libassi will head a nation-wide effort to form new local coalitions. His aim will be to increase from 33 to 100 the number of coalitions, which like the national organization, aim at focusing broad-based leadership and the resources of both public and private sectors on such urban problems as employment, housing, education and economic opportunity in low-income areas.

At a press conference, Libassi emphasized that his departure will bring no change in the department's civil rights enforcement policies.

"The steady movement toward dealing with larger schools in the North and moving away from small rural schools in the South" will be continued, he said.

In her new job, Mrs. Martin, a graduate of Fisk University and Howard University, will become one of the highest ranking Negroes in government.

Cumberland Marine Dies

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. William E. Propst, a fine young Marine from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CUMBERLAND MARINE DIES: PFC. WILLIAM E. PROPST, 21, KILLED IN VIETNAM

CUMBERLAND, April 16.—A 21-year-old Cumberland marine who had been in the service less than a year has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported today.

He was Pfc. William E. Propst, husband of Mrs. Lois M. Propst, of Brice Hollow road.

According to a telegram sent his family, he was killed Saturday near Quang Nam, South Vietnam.

Besides his wife, he is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Homer Propst; three brothers, Harlen J., Stanley and Rodney W. Propst, and six sisters, Mrs. Goldie Bennett, Mrs. Elsie G. Peterson, Mrs. Lois J. Bennett, Mrs. Anna M. Grogg, Mrs. Barbaret Wentling and Mrs. Carol L. Humbertson, all of the Cumberland area.

Guntersville, Ala., Celebrates 150th Birthday

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the 150th anniversary of the city of Guntersville, Ala.

This fine city has a very interesting history beginning with the settlement of the John Gunter family in 1818. Under unanimous consent, I submit a news article that appeared in the April 3 edition of the Guntersville Advertiser-Glean, which relates the history of Guntersville and commemorates this anniversary.

The article follows:

HEY—WE'RE HAVING OUR 150TH BIRTHDAY

Sequentennial, anyone?

Don't look now, but Guntersville has reached the ripe old age of 150.

It was in 1818 that the John Gunter family moved south of the river, forming the first permanent settlement where Guntersville is located today.

The Gunters had been in these parts a good many years before that but they lived north of the river, around Claysville.

When they crossed the river in 1818 they also started operating the first ferry boat service, letting people cross the Tennessee and marking this as a permanent location for commerce going north or south.

Guntersville became a thriving settlement long before it was officially incorporated as a city in 1847. Lippincott's Gazetteer of the World, a recognized authority in such matters, states that Guntersville was settled in 1818.

At that time this area was part of Georgia. The state of Alabama wasn't created until the following year, 1819. Marshall County wasn't formed until 1836, when it was carved out of Blount and Jackson counties.

Until 1835 the territory in Alabama south of the river was part of the Cherokee Nation. The village that was to become Guntersville, then, was in Indian country the first 17 years of its existence. Large-scale settlement didn't begin south of the river until the 1830s, when the Indians were ousted by the government and moved to Arkansas and other points west.

Accounts of the early days of the Guntersville area are sketchy, and in some cases the accounts don't agree. The following is what we were able to piece together:

When Indians or other prehistoric people inhabited this area isn't known. In any event,

they were not here continuously. In 1709 some Canadian explorers found Indians living along the Tennessee River and found a town, Tall, which some believe to have been on the site of Guntersville.

Evidence indicates that in the 1700's the Cherokees wandered back into this area from the upper headwaters of the Tennessee, where they had been forced by wars with the Shawnees and Chickasaws. One report is that the Cherokees drove the Chickasaws out of this area in the late 1700's and established themselves here.

John Gunter had come from Scotland to America with his parents in the latter part of the 1700's. They landed at Charleston, S.C.

John began trading with the Cherokees and Creeks in South Carolina, and ultimately began to live among the Cherokees, drifting with them from place to place. He married a full-blooded Cherokee woman and they began rearing a family.

The Gunters established a home at what is now Claysville around 1790. Three sons and three daughters were born to them. The boys were Samuel, Edward and John Jr. The girls were Jane, who married a Lt. Blackburn; Betsy, who was wed to Martin Scrimsher and Susan, who became a Vaught.

In 1814 Gen. Andrew Jackson and his army of Tennesseans came through this area during the Creek Indians Wars. He was headed south, toward what was to become known as the Battle of Horseshoe Bend on the Tallapoosa River. Jackson crossed the Tennessee at Whitesburg and marched his army over Brindlee Mountain to near Warrenton. There they camped for a time while Jackson was establishing a depot for his supplies at Fort Deposit, on the north side of the river at Honeycomb Creek.

While Jackson was here, the Cherokees in the village north of the river caught the war fever. Jackson encouraged them to raise a volunteer regiment which they did. Their major was Edward Gunter.

The regiment moved in advance of Jackson's main army and performed notably at the Horseshoe. Edward Gunter was wounded through the body, but recovered and returned home.

In 1817 Edward was granted a franchise to operate a ferry boat here, perhaps as a reward for his military services. Next year the Gunters moved south of the river, forming the first permanent settlement in the town that was to bear their name.

John Gunter built a large home a short distance from the ferry landing. This was near the point where the present bridge was built in the 1920's.

John Gunter, Jr. later built what was known as the White House in the same area.

Edward Gunter built his home in what later became Wyeth City and still later came to be called Southtown. It was on the rise about where Thomas Avenue crosses Loveless Street, the intersection with the four-way stop signs.

The Gunters established a large mercantile warehouse, and by the 1830s there were 15 to 20 families living near the White House. That, with several stores, constituted the village as of 1835.

As time went on the government came under increasing pressure from whites to make the Indian lands available for settlement. Part of what is now Marshall County was bought from the Indians in 1817. The rest was acquired by the Treaty of 1835, in which the Cherokees surrendered all their lands east of the Mississippi.

Shortly after the Indians lost their land, they moved west of the Mississippi. Some or all of the original Gunter family went along.

Today there are a good many Gunter families in Marshall County and nearby counties, although none right in Guntersville. As far as we know, however, the present Gunters are not related to the clan that founded Guntersville 150 years ago.

GUNTERS VISIT GUNTERSVILLE

Kenneth Gunter, a descendant of John Gunter, founder of Guntersville, passed through town recently.

It was Mr. Gunter's first visit to the city that bears his family's name. He lives in San Angelo, Tex., where he's with a TV cable company.

No Gunters have lived in Guntersville for many years, but there are lots of them in Texas. Kenneth's grandfather A. A. Gunter moved to St. Angelo in 1911 from around Bridgeport, Ala., and his three sons still live in St. Angelo. They are Kenneth's father E. C. Gunter, William M. Gunter, and R. C. Gunter. There was once a steamboat here called the R. C. Gunter, apparently named for a namesake of the present-day Texan.

Kenneth doesn't know how many "greats" you have to add to "grandson" to describe his relationship to the original John Gunter.

The First Lady Promotes Travel to America

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Fort Worth Star Telegram of April 9 describes how Mrs. Lyndon Johnson is lending her enormous talents and energies to the Discover America program—aimed at encouraging tourism within and to the United States. The First Lady made a 5-day trip through Texas, accompanied by Secretary Udall and a group of European travel editors. During the trip, the group took part in the opening day celebrations of HemisFair 1968 in San Antonio. Another important event took place when Mrs. Johnson conferred registered national historic landmark status upon the mission and presidio of La Bahia in Goliad.

This trip is just one more example of how Mrs. Johnson has actively involved herself in programs that are important for all Americans. Travel and tourism are enormous industries in this age, both in this country and around the world. Tourism is a vital element in our international balance of payments, and Mrs. Johnson is making a substantial contribution toward solving the problem by her personal involvement and example. I insert in the RECORD the article from the Fort Worth Star Telegram:

LADY BIRD DEDICATES TWO HISTORIC LANDMARKS IN STATE

(By Marthann Berry)

CORPUS CHRISTI.—Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, in the last day of a five-day swing through her home state, conferred registered national historic landmark status upon the Mission and Presidio of La Bahia in Goliad today.

Mrs. Johnson said travel is a "major habit" in America and tourists not only move toward the major attractions such as Manhattan, the Grand Canyon or San Francisco, "but also are seeking out-of-the-way places to discover and savor."

"La Bahia is such a place," she said.

The Goliad Mission is one of the Texas Independence landmarks. It was here that Col. James Fannin and his men were killed, and it was on the Mission Hill that the Mexican hero and patriot, Gen. Ignacio Zaragoza, was born.

Mrs. Johnson is winding up a "Discover America in Texas" tour. She is accompanied

by 40 European travel editors and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

This is the first of several trips that the first lady will make this spring and summer. Discover America is part of the President's program "See America First."

Following the Goliad ceremony, Mrs. Johnson and her group were to drive to Gonzales, through the Texas wildflower country, for another brief ceremony.

At nearby Palmetto State Park the group was to be honored with an old fashioned covered dish country luncheon before departing for San Antonio where they will board planes to return to Washington.

The group was at Padre Island Monday where Mrs. Johnson dedicated the island as a national seashore.

Mrs. Johnson's tour began with a visit to Fredericksburg—mainly for the benefit of the German writers—then a refreshment stop and short swing through the LBJ Ranch.

The group was in San Antonio for opening day celebrations of HemisFair '68. Mrs. Johnson made several dedications at the HemisFair opening.

The Architect and Housing

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the April 1966 issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects carries the most inclusive statement to date of the AIA concerning the architect's responsibilities in solving the Nation's acute housing problem.

Because of the importance of the architect and the AIA in providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for Americans, this article should be of interest to my colleagues:

THE ARCHITECT AND HOUSING

We are at a time in history, after 200 years of homebuilding in America, when all involved now concur that procedures and programs—federal/local, public/private—have not begun to achieve the national housing goal of providing a decent home and suitable living environment for every family.

The notion of housing as a building type is a modern one whose importance to society is clearly manifested by widespread audible concern about it, including major governmental programs. The great ages of architecture as our historians have recorded them showed little evidence of the architect's preoccupation with dwelling places for any but the affluent.

Today, the architect must recognize that he has an accelerated role to play in the housing industry: the custom-designed field where he has traditionally been involved, the homebuilding market where he must enlarge his areas of contribution, and government and privately assisted low-income housing—the exploding sector most in need of his attention.

In the year ahead, the AIA, working with our allied professionals, the building industry and government, will critically review existing and proposed housing programs and also will develop new and expanded ones with the aim of achieving our national housing goal. The following areas indicate issues on which the architectural profession will address itself in the immediate future.

GOVERNMENT'S PARTICIPATION

It is a well-established historical fact that the housing segment of the construction industry as a major source of employment is closely related to the economic health of

the community. It bears the major responsibility for rebuilding and stabilizing the central city. It has for more than two decades heavily relied upon federal programs to underwrite or fund the construction of low- and moderate-income housing. Such programs require months of staffing, preparation and scheduling in order to respond to the availability of new funds.

Therefore, the AIA urges that federal programs be administered in a manner consistent with the maintenance of a sound and healthy housing industry, which should not unduly bear the responsibility for absorbing major adjustments in the nation's economic climate. The withholding of funds without regard for need in order to control inflationary trends is just as ill-advised as to overfinance more housing starts than the proven demand dictates. During the crisis in our cities, there must be a full utilization of the major tool available for renewal of neighborhoods, i.e., construction and rehabilitation.

The AIA recognizes that one function of government on the federal, state, metropolitan and municipal levels is to encourage adequate housing for all strata of the population. The Institute also recognizes the need for government at all levels to participate in the development of programs for low-income families.

Low-Income Housing.—The AIA believes that the public housing concept developed during the '30s for the displaced and the poverty stricken has proven unsuited to today's city problems.

A completely new solution must be found. The best long-term answer is to reduce the number of unemployable by improved education and by overcoming discrimination. However, as an interim solution, the AIA believes that there is currently no substitute to government assistance for the poorest, whose needs are for broad forms of social services which cannot be met through the private sector or other forms of subsidy. Furthermore, community balance requires public programs, preferably under local governmental responsibility with assistance from state and federal levels.

Major reform is imperative in government procedures for housing relocation and related compensation as imposed by large-scale public works. Present inequitable procedures are a primary cause of today's bitterness and unrest.

What has been built to date has shown that the disadvantaged poor should not be isolated in housing institutions. We find many of the present concepts of tenancy to be self-defeating. We look to a definition of low-income housing that will encompass the needs of a family through good and bad fortune; that will not punish the ambitious by eviction; that will allow certain forms of co-operative management for those tenants who choose to stay and invest their funds and efforts in their home.

We see as an essential ingredient of successful government programs, a mandate for the creation of a "good" or qualitative housing environment rather than that which is described as being merely "safe" or "sanitary" or "not of elaborate or extravagant design or materials."

Homeownership.—For families of limited income whose physical circumstances and location are favorable, homeownership can be an extremely desirable social goal. But this alone cannot do the hoped-for job without other improvements and reforms including: 1) an increase in the supply of houses for sale in the lower-cost brackets; 2) the upgrading and maintenance of municipal fire, police and sanitary services, schools and community facilities in the urban areas; 3) improved availability of fire, liability and property insurance; 4) a broadly applied fair housing law that will maximize the alternatives by creating a free and fluid market.

Rent Supplements.—We see rent supplements as a legitimate assist to private in-

dustry and the housing business in certain market areas. Such programs can make feasible the private development of good housing that otherwise would be economically out of reach of low-income families without requiring the government to invest in additional public housing. Therefore, the AIA recommends an immediate and significant expansion in the philosophy and funding of rent supplement programs.

Rehabilitation—The AIA recognizes that residential rehabilitation provides a multifaceted tool. It enlarges the inventory of good housing by putting back neglected and abandoned units on the market. It helps to preserve both the character of existing neighborhoods and the architecture of earlier periods. To be effective, we feel the upper limits on these programs should be raised to meet the demands of the market. For a more widely effective effort in our cities, we see the need for rehabilitation programs outside of limited "target areas."

State, Metropolitan and Municipal Government—The AIA notes that some of the foregoing programs can also become the function of local governments. However, there are certain goals which are specifically non-federal in nature. They include reform of taxation and land use policies so as to provide incentives that 1) encourage rehabilitation and maintenance of housing and neighborhoods, and 2) would create balanced communities which integrate housing with commercial, educational and recreational facilities in viable urban locations.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

The AIA recognizes that one way to provide more and better housing is to produce it for less money. American industry has demonstrated its capacity to respond quickly in other research areas, and if given the necessary impetus through private/public coordination and funding, can also respond to advanced housing technology—and in a very short period of time.

Housing technology refers to a broad definition of research including demonstrations and experiments in new approaches to the living environment. This should encompass experiments in new towns, new towns-in-towns and advanced planning techniques for existing cities involving all of its components: the central city, its suburbia and its rural surroundings. New approaches and systems must be developed concurrently with government-owned and -operated housings.

The needs of human beings must be better understood. Research with the collaboration of the social scientists should be instituted to provide a better understanding of the anonymous dwellers' needs. Existing and subsequent housing must be visited and re-evaluated so that their occupants' experience will guide future planning.

Efforts must be made in conjunction with the labor force and the building trades in advancing research and technology, and ways must be developed to allow existing codes to recognize experimentation in building design and construction in order to be able to evaluate new ideas effectively.

Housing construction technology must be advanced through research for new ideas, the further development of existing technology and transfer of the experience of other industries such as electronics, aerospace, automotive, shipbuilding, etc.; and through acceleration of industrialized housing exemplified by the prefabrication and mobile home industries.

ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Professional design services must be made available to all in our society. The AIA supports community assistance programs which utilize the capabilities that our profession can offer.

We recognize our moral responsibility to develop and sponsor programs that would provide professional assistance in producing

new and rehabilitated housing and neighborhoods where otherwise such help would not be available. However, the AIA seeks creation and implementation of programs and legislation that would provide financial assistance to housing development organizations and sponsors, enabling accomplishment of the initial planning of needed housing by non-profit groups which are not financially equipped to pay for the necessary professional services prior to final commitment. To further heighten the new sense of "social obligation" of the private sector, a fair profit must be incorporated in any program, new or old. Our economy is based on the profit motive, and any sense of altruism will be enhanced if a reasonable reward is available.

DESIGN FOR HUMAN NEEDS

Architects, in earning a leadership role in translating the needs of people for shelter into physical forms, must become involved in the governmental functions of programming and policymaking which result in the physical housing product. Today's decision makers often are unaware of the consequences of their actions, and without meaningful participation by architects, sufficient emphasis is not placed on the important relationship of physical environment to human well-being.

Architects have a contribution to make and must accept both a professional and a public responsibility in the review of housing proposals and programs. Arbitrary codes and restrictive requirements must be replaced by professionals making evaluations on the basis of human needs.

"Well-designed municipal structures such as hospitals, libraries and even schools are often available to the underprivileged, but when they go home they best look at their television sets in the dark." JACK C. COHEN, AIA.

I sense that housing has been somewhat of a stepchild to the profession, but hopefully we architects are beginning to recognize our responsibilities toward assuming our proper role.

Housing is the most tangible physical aspect in the lives of those individuals caught in the urban crisis. Well-designed municipal structures such as hospitals, libraries and even schools are often available to the underprivileged, but when they go home they best look at their television sets in the dark.

We of the architectural profession have all too frequently made ourselves think and act as technicians, with too much regard for building codes, governmental regulations, zoning policies and, yes, fees, and have not concerned ourselves with the conceptual and philosophical design objectives.

We are fortunate that both our professional leadership and a great number of individual AIA members have become aware of the architects' isolation from housing matters and are attempting to do something about it. More and more practitioners are participating in community action groups. And so we are presented with a direct opportunity to establish dialogue with the poorly housed, in new and dynamic ways. There are attempts in some parts of the nation to promote an exchange between the building industry and the profession.

The AIA in the past has approached the subject without a comprehensive view of the social impacts involved in the process of providing housing for all.

Now, in this year of cataclysmatic change and crisis, it is imperative that architects fulfill their role as the shapers of an excellent environment for all citizens.

Our contribution to the urban dilemma must be felt now—next year will be too late.

"A whole new breed of architects could develop if low-cost housing becomes, as it must, a large-scale enterprise."—JEROME P. CAVANAGH.

There are never enough good houses to go around. That is one of our nation's recurring domestic dilemmas.

In these days of mounting prosperity, the housing situation has become almost intolerable. And we seem to be running out of answers.

Government really did not become involved extensively in housing until the late 1930s. Its goals may have seemed impressive, but results have been rather limited.

The fact is that we have been underbuilding for years. For example, in eight years the metropolitan Detroit area gained nearly 700,000 people but less than 160,000 additional housing units.

These figures do not reflect the number of units that have become old, substandard and uninhabitable. The reality of the statistics hits hardest among the lower-income groups whose earnings only recently have been sensed and surveyed.

These are the people who get the old housing as it is "filtered down" (abandoned, discarded, land contracted, leased, subleased and sold) to them from those whose economic conditions improve. Yet even this filtered-down housing is becoming difficult to obtain in many urban area markets.

The problem of obtaining housing, whether old or new, is getting worse. As new construction lags, the availability of older housing lessens even more. The effect on the already ill-housed urban poor is staggering.

Low-rent or public housing has, only in a limited way, come to grips with this aspect of the problem. In 30 years, fewer than 640,000 units of public housing have been built nationally. Current estimates show that the low-income population easily outnumbers this supply category by more than 50 to 1.

Except for wartime demands in the 1940s, the housing supply did not appear too uncertain in Detroit until just a few years ago.

There are three major factors involved in the recent tightening of the city's housing supply which seem to have relevance nationally as well. They are:

1. A steady decline in new housing from 43,000 in 1954 to less than 16,000 in 1961, followed by only a slight surge back to 29,000 during 1967.

2. Necessary clearance for freeway construction and, to a lesser extent, slum clearance through urban renewal.

3. The inevitable aging and deterioration of older housing, making many more units less habitable every year.

The task of bringing housing supply in line with demand and need is going to be a most formidable urban challenge for some time. It can be a futile one if present trends in the housing construction industry prevail.

One way to increase the housing supply is by developing and implementing cost-cutting, time- and labor-saving methods of construction on a large scale. This, to most people in the business, means cheap housing. But it need not be.

Lately, many of our local officials have even concluded that there is no such thing as low-cost housing. But if the need is to be met there must be more low-cost housing constructed, and not just at the current experimental and piecemeal rate. Hundreds of thousands of units must be built and made available now or in the next few years.

This will require a reordering of national priorities on the part of government, combined with a more complete and actual commitment from business, particularly the real estate investment and building firms.

In all of these matters, the architect has an essential role. Esthetically and professionally, there is much to be achieved. It takes much more than award-winning designs to make low-cost housing desirable and livable.

Prefabricated housing and packaged unit

construction are popular methods now used on a limited scale in many cities.

Locally, our Metropolitan Detroit Citizens Development Authority (MDCDA) is sponsoring a demonstration project in which one-to four-bedroom housing units will be constructed at a cost of \$10 a square foot. This is nearly three times less expensive than several low-rent apartment buildings for the elderly, now delayed because of high bids.

These MDCDA-sponsored homes will be built in groupings of eight units or less. Each will include a living room, dining room and furnished kitchen. The rent, without any federal supplementation, will range from \$90 to \$115 a month.

It has been a long, long time since any housing units have been built at \$10 a square foot in Detroit. Not even the high-rise efficiency apartments, still being planned and constructed here, can come near this low-cost figure.

This newest attempt at low-cost construction in Detroit will be watched with great interest and attention. If it succeeds, the MDCDA will go ahead with similar projects on urban renewal land, particularly in the city's model neighborhood area where a variety of rehabilitation and rebuilding programs are being planned by the residents.

As projects such as this become more commonplace, demand for innovative architectural assistance will increase.

A whole new breed of architects could develop if low-cost housing becomes, as it must, a large-scale enterprise. These architects will have to be dedicated professionals who can imagine, compute, design, prod and persuade in helping to produce decent, livable housing for every family.

The role of the architect is clear. To give him less than full attention and support would detract from the urgency of the task. There simply must be more good housing to go around.

"Most architects today shy away from the increasingly complex problems of providing better housing and a better living environment for everyone."—JAMES SAN JULE.

The position of the architect related to housing has always been a curious and disturbing one in the United States: At no time in our history has had more than a peripheral influence for the better on the design or quality of the housing and the communities in which most Americans have lived.

Despite the showcase homes, apartment structures and new community plans which appear in architectural publications, this condition is almost as true today as it was 100 years ago. Of the nearly 34 million housing units built in hundreds of communities since the end of World War II, only a relatively few have been designed or influenced by architects.

Across the nation, architects talk freely, and sometimes bitterly, about the reasons for their lack of involvement with the design of housing: "There's not enough money in it." "It takes too much time." "Frankly, we don't know how to work with the builders."

Except for philosophical discussions over cocktails or at professional gatherings, and the occasional design of a luxury house or a multifamily structure, most architects today shy away from the increasingly complex problems of providing better housing and a better living environment for everyone. And it has always been so.

This is a sad and wasteful situation, and one for which builders of housing, financing institutions, government at all levels and schools, as well as architects, must share the blame.

It is sad because of an ever-increasing frustration and cynicism on the part of architects who believe there is little or nothing they can do about the conditions of housing. It is wasteful because, with only a few minor exceptions, the skills, knowledge, professionalism and intellectuality of architects are today so little reflected in the quality of hous-

ing design and in the creation of communities.

The tremendous new need for housing in the years ahead, and its influence on our living environment, demands a historic change in the relationship of the architect to this building type. All who are now involved with housing, and all who are concerned about housing, must share in bringing about that change.

One practical starting point should certainly be the creation of a better understanding and a closer working relationship between architects and builders, not only in the design and production of the housing and the communities which are possible today but also in the development of new forms and in the broader social, economic and political considerations which are already urgent.

Much of today's narrow thinking on the part of both architects and builders must be put aside if this is to be accomplished. Both have much to gain economically and psychologically by bridging the gulf which now separates most of them.

Important business needs in the housing industry today can provide some of the structural materials for that bridge. To cite four:

Most builders know they need a better product to sell in an increasingly sophisticated and demanding market. Builder-architect teams can create that better market.

Most builders know they need new technology to drive down construction costs and to help solve the growing shortage of construction manpower. Builder-architect cooperation can help create that new technology.

Most builders are aware of the need for housing for low- and middle-income families and of its business potential. Builders and architects, working together, can help develop methods to meet this need.

Most builders know the need to modernize antiquated building codes and zoning and land use policies. Cooperation between builders and architects on various government levels would help make more rational a situation which now hinders progress in housing and environmental design and in building technology.

More and better housing will be produced, and architects and builders alike will profit from such cooperative efforts to face these business needs. And architects for the first time will enter the mainstream of our nation's housing.

Overriding all is the unique contribution that architects can make to the American people in their present and urgent search for a better living environment and for a higher quality of life. This search takes many forms, but certainly a most important one is a deep-felt urge to satisfy emotional and psychological needs in housing. The architect by his training, and by his intellectual decision to be such a professional, has the most crucial part of all to play in making certain that this part of the search is successful.

"There is no single housing design formula which will meet all social needs."—RALPH WARBURTON, AIA.

The national housing design objective—the provision of an adequate number of appropriate dwellings in good community environments—has not been met.

Though current efforts comprise in dollar volume over 30 percent of all physical development activity, they do not yet include realistic participation by architects, sociologists, industrialists and others whose skills must increasingly be brought to bear on housing goals. Design services are vitally needed if the national level of the environment for man is to be elevated.

We are developing annually over 400 square miles of land with about 1½ million housing units. While adding to our existing stock of about 65 million units, this degree

of production barely provides for our expanding population and largely ignores replacement needs. Forty percent of the nation's families are frequently forced into dilapidated dwellings because little is offered at a price they can afford.

At the same time in other countries, recent estimates show that housing is being built for as little as one-third of our costs, though foreign space standards are often much lower than ours, to be sure.

In some areas, foreign productivity is as high as costs are low. The Soviet Union, for example, is currently building housing for all aspects of its population at the rate of 3 million units per year—over twice the rate of our production—and the construction quality of this housing is rising rapidly.

Review and improvement of our national housing effort is overdue. Those observers concerned with qualitative matters insist upon the need for more research feedback leading to a significant refinement of family and societal benefits. Exponents of quantitative indices would like to see more housing scheduled to meet defined needs, costs refined systematically and the delivery time shortened. Both design concerns are important.

There is no single housing design formula which will meet all social needs. Low family incomes may lead to the likelihood of overcrowding: Social contact can become too facile, and strong architectural means to develop a measure of individual privacy are required.

Also, while the small percentage of upper-income families can achieve the freedoms of choice and individuality in many ways, the large group of lower-income households finds that these vital expressions are more directly linked to their dwellings. Thus they see the design of their homes as very important.

New forms of flexible administration arrangements are emerging which may involve many types of tenure including public housing, leasing, cooperatives, condominiums and conventional ownership. Innovative construction methods can also play a role when sweat equity by future residents is involved. These directions are opening up new areas for imaginative planning, design and construction.

One significant way of upgrading quality aspects, saving construction time and reducing costs can involve industrial production techniques. On the design agenda for over 30 years, the development of mass-produced and mass-erected modules (multiroom units), components (baths, kitchens) and elements (posts, beams, panels)—and combinations of these—is beginning to accelerate.

Over 40 percent of all multi-family housing in Great Britain, France and Russia is built using industrialized systems techniques. Under HUD sponsorship, several refined alternatives are being explored through construction, some in connection with the Federal Lands for Critical Urban Needs effort.

In addition to developing new materials and methods, the action of design professionals in identifying and resisting artificial constraints to the use of new technology can complement several federal activities. Success in this area will contribute to enlarging design capacity and reducing costs so that the needs of millions for well-designed standard housing can be fulfilled.

A strong urban design plan for the entire neighborhood can wisely embrace many public and private construction activities. One of these in an existing community sparked by the Model Cities program will increasingly be rehabilitation. There are over 25 million housing units over 35 years old, and many now are capable of significant refurbishment.

Efforts to meet broad housing development goals are being undertaken more and more through the cooperative sponsorship efforts of government and private enterprise. When optimally structured, a client team can over-

come many obstacles to progress and unleash new opportunities for the design team to explore. Coordinated commitment to design and build better and faster is vital.

This commitment can help achieve the goals of providing a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. To meet this goal, President Johnson has proposed building 300,000 new housing units next year for low- and middle-income families—three times more than last year. This campaign would intensify until it produced 6 million low- and middle-income units over a 10-year period—11 times our performance in the previous decade.

Architects are critical to the success of this effort. To the degree that professionals engage in it aggressively, bring with them all the necessary related skills, and actively cooperate with public and private groups will the quality of the environment be raised. This is our responsibility, and we must perform.

"The architect must act with a new boldness and a depth of creativity not evident in the recent past."—WILLIAM L. RAFSKY

The housing and community development programs of the United States have evolved into a comprehensive effort aimed at reacting to the total cycle of urban changes—growth, maturity, decline, decay.

The focus of activity has shifted from the individual housing site in the 1930s to the urban renewals project area in the 1950s to the total community in the 1960s and likely to the metropolitan area and the region by the 1970s.

Nor can the national effort to rebuild urban areas be measured solely in physical terms. We are increasingly concerned about building the kind of urban structure that will recognize the social needs of every facet of our population and extend opportunities for everyone to participate in the fullness of American life. The emergence of the low-income and minority family as a full partner in the American society requires a special sensitivity to his needs and aspirations.

The scope and complexity of rebuilding urban America presents special challenges to the architect. He occupies a responsible, if not the pivotal, role in determining whether as a nation and as a society we will measure up to producing quality and relevance in the rebuilding of our urban areas.

If he is to fill this role, the architect must act with a new boldness and a depth of creativity not evident in the recent past. He must get to the heart of understanding the best of our urban society and then translate it into a viable environment—not an easy task.

Architects, like all of us who are involved in today's urban world, are searching for relevance—both as individuals and as professionals. But it is particularly important for the architect who, in his best tradition, is not just a draftsman who executes plans but an interpreter of his times who works with ideas and creates new forms.

This struggle to understand and to be relevant is beginning now, I understand, in the schools of architecture where students are no longer satisfied with the prospect of building architectural monuments. I am told that today's student has an acute social conscience related to the problems of urban life and that he is often active in political affairs.

This is certainly a healthy sign since it reflects the student's interest in understanding the important issues of society in which he must live and work. Yet his involvement only starts here. His true role is to infuse his knowledge and concern about urban issues into the substantive work of his profession.

The substance of architecture in today's urban world is related to the entire fabric of the city and to the total living environ-

ment. The architect must be concerned with air and water pollution and the abrasiveness of noise. He must understand the desires of urban man to retain individual identity and privacy in an encroaching world and to live with some sense of the changing seasons. The techniques and materials available to assist him in this attempt to relate his art to the contemporary world are fortunately expanding.

Yet, in adjusting his sights to the needs of the times, the architect possibly has no better resource than that of the tradition which has produced great architecture in the past; it is characterized by three basic elements: boldness, relevance and creativity. The times call for greatness—and great architects.

"Here is another opportunity for architects to join with others in designing standards that are politically feasible and for which subsidies are practicable."—JOHN SPARKMAN.

To the outside world, the United States is an affluent society with all the material possessions one would ever want or hope to have. Unfortunately, this rosy view is only partially true.

It is not true for the millions of poor families living in city or rural slums. Nor is it true for a large number of middle-class families who may have safe and sanitary shelter but who live in an environment seriously deficient in the amenities that are necessary to help them enjoy a full and fruitful life.

The national housing policy refers not only to a goal of decent housing but to a "suitable living environment" for every American family. The architect often carries the responsibility for giving meaning to these words.

As time goes on, the words will probably remain unchanged but their interpretation will change as our society progresses and as we learn how to build an environment more suitable to man's aspirations for a satisfactory life. The nation's architects and urban planners should be in the forefront in the development of the latest designs to carry out the national housing goal concept.

We have been providing financial assistance for over 30 years to local communities to help get rid of slums and to provide decent shelter for its poor. In the process, we have learned a great deal. The government's first effort through public housing was strictly a brick and mortar job undertaken with the notion that all the poor needed was a roof over their heads.

The public housing effort was replaced by slum clearance and urban redevelopment effort authorized by the Housing Act of 1949. This was broadened in 1954 to the urban renewal concept which visualized a total assault on all housing deficiencies through slum clearance, rehabilitation or conservation. Great strides were made to clear out and rebuild some of the poorest areas of the cities, but the program ran into serious difficulty because of its concentration on real estate objectives and not on dislocated residents.

The next major shift in the US city rebuilding job was the introduction of the Model Cities concept whereby federal funds would help rebuild entire areas of the cities in a comprehensive manner including the upgrading of its residents and its social institutions.

The program is basically sound and a natural and necessary answer to the varied and interlocking problems present in certain areas of the nation's cities. Of course, until we have demonstrated success in this effort, we will have to proceed on faith that it will work and that the whole job can be done if the proper effort is made at local and national levels.

The one big missing link to make Model Cities successful is effective rehabilitation. A reasonably good financial assistance program has been developed to help the resi-

dents meet the monthly charges in this connection, but very little progress has been made in developing a satisfactory and effective technique for the physical work involved in carrying out rehabilitation on a large scale.

Until a method for rehabilitation, involving mass acquisition and volume production can be developed, I believe that the Model Cities program will fall far short of its objectives. This should not be allowed to happen, and I am confident that once private industry, including architects, recognizes the importance of this problem, it will meet the challenge and join government in resolving it.

Parallel to the program to clear up slums and rebuild cities, the federal government has been actively engaged in helping American families get decent housing by helping them finance homes and apartments. The first and by far the most productive has been the Federal Home Loan Bank System involving principally the savings and loan associations. At the present time, such associations have \$122 billion of outstanding mortgage loans, or about 44 percent of total residential debt.

If the system can be kept confined primarily to mortgage lending, it has the potential for financing well over 50 percent of all new housing built. Unfortunately, in recent years the associations have been serving primarily upper middle-income groups, with little effort being made to direct their lending activities to the area of greatest need: the low- and moderate-income groups in the cities.

Recently, the industry has indicated a willingness to involve itself in inner-city housing problems. The details have not yet been worked out, but I look forward to a significant breakthrough once the giant lending industry becomes effective in this area of greatest need.

The Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans Administration and the Farmers Home Administration, through their mortgage insurance programs, in combination with the Federal National Mortgage Association, have provided the greatest assistance to enable families of moderate income obtain decent housing.

In recent years, however, these programs have been unresponsive to the housing needs of the low- and moderate-income families. Various financial aids have been developed starting in 1961 to provide a subsidy to bring down the cost to the level these families can afford. The 221(d)(3) below-market program and the rent supplement program were designed for this purpose and are currently being used for rental housing.

Last year a new interest-subsidy program for the purchase of housing was devised by the Senate Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee which would give the benefit of a 3-percent loan to certain lower-income families seeking homeownership. The proposal is a part of S. 2700, now pending before the US Senate.

These programs have a great potential but, unfortunately, much of their benefit may be lost because housing costs have risen so sharply in recent years. In the pending homeownership plan, a mortgage ceiling of \$15,000 (or \$17,500 in high-cost areas) would be established under the program.

Already we have been told that homebuilders cannot build under these ceilings. We have probably not heard the last of this, but our committee takes the attitude that, for government subsidy programs, these are reasonable ceilings and, instead of raising them, insists that industry produce the housing to fit. Here is another opportunity for architects to join with others in designing standards that are politically feasible and for which subsidies are practicable.

Congress has developed a wide range of tools whereby federal assistance can be obtained for the clearance of slums, the re-

building of cities and the financing of new and existing houses.

It is now up to private industry, the architects, the urban planners, and the homebuilders to give these programs life and to provide the expertise to devise new community plans, new housing design and new construction techniques which, in combination with government financial aid, can produce housing in the kind of environment that our great masses of American people can enjoy and afford.

"We have a public responsibility to see that potential clients who cannot afford large budgets, or who do not wish to use full architectural services, have the benefit of consultation."—ROBERT L. DURHAM, FAIA.

Our nation must not continue its current direction in housing. While the factors causing the summer riots are elusive, poor housing is high on the list.

The housing industry is restive and has been especially plagued by fluctuating economic factors. Both federal and local governments are exploring new approaches to public housing. Policies being discussed by members of Congress remain unclear. In this situation of unrest and confusion, the architectural profession has both opportunity and responsibility.

The suburban evolution which has left us with urban revolution indicates that we do not have solutions for the problems that beset our citizens, within or without our cities.

That portion of our population which has violently demonstrated contempt for its surroundings has been given no choice. Suburbanites who thought they had a choice are exhibiting dissatisfaction with the dullness of their environment.

At no time in the history of public housing has its results been subject to such questioning. Private housing, supported by government programs designed to provide maximum standards and maximum quality, has produced unsatisfactory quality at maximum price.

We have the responsibility of fitting ourselves to the twofold housing task: making our professional services more widely available to the American public and promoting our skills and knowledge as an accepted standard in housing of every type and quality.

To this end, the AIA is making a basic reappraisal of its policies. We are preparing to offer political leadership on every subject in this field—a new role because for too long we architects have been content to react to the proposals of others.

We must offer more than our carefully conceived and positive advice to legislators and all others concerned with housing problems; we must also initiate legislation.

It seems obvious that we must also provide technical leadership. Architects must exert more influence in the writing of better and more standardized building codes.

We must involve ourselves with technical manufacturing processes so that design concepts become a part of industrialization processes. In order to establish policies that will make US industrial know-how available in housing, we must sit down with labor as well.

We must become the advocates of future home dwellers in providing every device and policy that might produce better housing at reasonable cost. This includes multidisciplinary community design (economic planning, transportation, etc.) and systems approaches.

Suburbia was built in a fashion that often prevented the orderly growth of cities, resulting in wasted and despoiled landscapes and lack of sense of community. We and our professional colleagues, along with a growing segment of the American public, have learned much from the experience of the past two decades.

Serving notice that the profession is vitally interested in housing requires leadership

from individual architects, from AIA chapters and from the Institute nationally. We must assure the public that we are ready to become involved; and lest we think we have demonstrated this involvement, try making a few calls among the architects listed in the Yellow Pages under the pretense of seeking assistance on the design of a small house.

It is high time that individuals can more readily obtain architectural consulting services on housing matters. We have a public responsibility to see that potential clients who cannot afford large budgets, or who do not wish to use full architectural services, have the benefit of consultation. However, we still maintain it is preferable that the architect coordinates the complete design process.

Even the casual student of past civilizations has noted that one of the first signs of decay was the desire not to get involved. We stand aghast at reports that witnesses turn their backs on attack and robbery. Is the housing crisis any less an example of non-commitment? Our creative talents and our professional responsibilities demand that we face involvement with housing people, rich and poor.

Only by assuming active leadership politically, technically and professionally can we offer more than lip service in building a better environment. We have the capabilities; do we now have the will?

Washington Reconstruction: An "Alice in Wonderland" Epic

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital under reconstruction could not have produced more myth and tales if prepared by Lewis Carroll.

I include clippings from the local newspapers following my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 13, 1968]

LOOTED STORE'S OWNER DEFIES LAW TOO, AND GETS RESULTS

BALTIMORE.—The operator of a looted men's shop purposely got himself arrested Friday, but he accomplished his mission.

Raymond Ely, enraged after his shop was broken into for the third time since rioting broke out in Baltimore last Saturday, took direct action.

Donning a gas mask to protect himself from tear gas released in the shop during the night, Ely tossed debris onto the sidewalk.

"You've got to break a few laws to get attention," said the 38-year-old Ely. "Stokely Carmichael can run a roadblock, but I can't throw trash into the street. It's enough to make a sane man go nuts."

Ely was charged with disorderly conduct and released on his own recognizance, but he considered it worth while. The debris, which the city wouldn't take from the store, was removed from the sidewalk.

"The fact that I behaved like a maniac today got me more results than behaving like a gentleman for three days," Ely said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 17, 1968]

NEGRO-RUN GHETTO MAPPED BY PRIDE

The top officials of Pride, Inc., said yesterday they are drawing up a master plan for the redevelopment of the riot-hit parts of Washington that would give Negroes control of the business, social and political life there.

They called for a halt to all rebuilding

efforts and an end to the city government's "business-as-usual" philosophy until they complete their master plan within six to eight weeks.

Specifically, Mary Treadwell, director of program development for Pride, called for:

The Small Business Administration to stop processing all disaster loans for riot-hit businesses. Pride officials are trying to set up a meeting with the SBA.

The SBA and local lending institutions to refuse loans to businesses in those areas unless they are 51 per cent owned by Negroes. The Pride officials said the loans are "economically unfeasible" because the businesses will only be burned again.

Negro contractors be hired to clear the burned-out sections and convert them into parks until planning is completed.

The Pride officials—Carroll Harvey, Marion Barry and Miss Treadwell—define the affected areas as strips along 7th and 14th Streets NW. and H Street NE. They did not give precise definitions of the areas.

The planning, they said, would be done by the Negro community—not just Pride the federally financed self-help organization that is shifting from cleanup projects to establishing businesses of its own.

Harvey proposed that the city government and lending institutions establish a \$5 million revolving fund that could be lent to Negroes on a long-term low-interest basis so they can gain economic security.

He said the Government should train ghetto residents in business management and accounting, investigate the small number of liquor licenses in the city held by Negroes, restrict the number of liquor stores allowed in a neighborhood, control "quality, price and credit exploitation" in the innercity, close stores that sell inferior merchandise and prohibit the Redevelopment Land Agency from establishing economic segregation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

UPO DEFERS FINAL ACTION ON REJECTING FEDERAL FUNDS

(By Betty James)

The board of the United Planning Organization last night deferred action until next week on a proposal that UPO reject all fiscal 1969 funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the federal anti-poverty agency.

The board voted 14 to 6 to consider the motion at a special meeting April 25. The deadline for submission of budget proposals to OEO was today, but UPO's deferral of action does not necessarily mean it could not still participate in the federal funds.

Thomas E. Payne, chief representative of the poor on the board of UPO, made the motion for rejection. He argued that the money that OEO says is available again has been reduced and is inadequate to fight poverty here. Rejecting the money will wake up OEO and Congress, he suggested.

ASKS REVISED PROGRAM

Payne said if UPO does submit a proposal, it should completely revamp its program, turning from community organization to community development.

Washington's civil disturbance demonstrated that only crisis brings response, Payne said. It also demonstrated that UPO's job in community organization is completed, in that UPO has made needy citizens aware of their problems, he said.

If UPO asks for money, it should be for programs like a multi-million-dollar revolving fund to buy and build housing for the poor, Payne said. Frederick B. Lee, president of UPO, said OEO has told his organization in the past that such funding is against OEO policy.

SOME \$12 MILLION AVAILABLE

Payne is concerned primarily with the \$8.6 million OEO has said is available for the Dis-

trict for programs such as community organization and legal services.

Also involved, however, is action on proposals for \$923,000 for the suburbs, \$359,000 for the Housing Development Corp. and \$2.2 million for the Opportunities Industrialization Center. The total is \$12.1 million.

Mrs. William H. Wood, chairman of the community action committee in Prince Georges County, who cannot attend the meeting on April 25, voted last night against the motion to reject the funds.

WARNED ON GAMBLE

Speaking to Payne's motion, Theodore Hagans, a board member, said, "I have no desire to create any more crises in Washington at the expense of the poor people. All of us sitting here will not be the sufferers if something goes wrong with this gamble."

Wiley A. Branton, executive director of UPO, said if the board doesn't act on the budget proposals the alternative will be for the District government to try to take over the poverty program, as it can do under amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Another board member, James P. Gibbons, Jr., who supported Payne, declared that should this happen, "I think the mayor is at least as responsive to the community as this board is. UPO may go back to being another planning organization, and that mightn't be so bad."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

GROUP SEEKS NEGRO CONTROL OF RIOT REBUILDING PROGRAM

(By Paul Delaney and Shirley Elder)

A group of Negro businessmen yesterday formed an organization to demand black control of rebuilding and subsequent ownership and management of properties in areas destroyed by last week's disorders.

Members of the Black Economic Achievement and Construction of Neighborhoods (BEACON) said they will present a 10-point program outlining their proposals to Mayor Walter E. Washington on Monday.

In their proposals, the group urges the mayor to set up a meeting with appropriate federal agencies to implement the program, which includes demands that Negroes plan and rebuild the affected areas and that citizen participation and youth involvement be assured.

Cochairman of BEACON are Mrs. Cecelia Scott and Ed Murphy, both owners of restaurants. The announcement was made at a press conference held at Murphy's supper club at 2227 Georgia Avenue NW. Spokesman for the group was Chuck Stone, former aide to Adam Clayton Powell.

WANTS RESIDENTS INVOLVED

Stone said BEACON is not insisting that the mayor and the federal government deal exclusively with it. He said a similarly constituted, representative black organization could carry out the same goals.

In a related move, the Rev. Channing E. Phillips, leader of the pro-Kennedy Democrats here, also said residents of each neighborhood should be involved in the planning and rebuilding of riot-shattered areas.

"Washington now has the opportunity to rebuild . . ." Phillips said in a press conference. "To do so, we cannot simply put up again the same kind of city that was burned down; we face both the great opportunity to try something new and the necessity of doing it so the whole tragedy is not simply repeated."

Neighborhood stores should be owned and operated by those who live nearby, Phillips continued. He called for government loans to enable Negroes to set up grocery and other co-ops.

All this takes money, Phillips said, and money must be spent, both private and public money. He suggested that Congress give top priority to urban and human needs and,

as money is released from the war in Vietnam, it should be diverted to the war on poverty at home.

PROPOSALS

BEACON'S 10 points are:

1. That a program for redevelopment and rebuilding be placed under total control of the black community by an agency such as BEACON or one similar in composition and purpose.

2. That the agency be an all-black one empowered to hire, let contracts and supervise all planning in cooperation with government agencies and necessary outside professional consultants. The government agencies would have no veto powers over the single agency, but the agency could veto suggestions of consultants.

3. That planning for rebuilding begin with full utilization of black architects, urban planners, contractors, subcontractors, economists, insurance companies and agents, real estate companies and other black executives and administrators.

4. That Title II of the Public Housing Law dealing with citizen participation be amended to be interpreted to mean one-third black minimum.

5. That all federal and city agencies concerned with the problems of the current crisis consult with BEACON or the designated agency to devise tightly-coordinated and integrated plans for rebuilding the devastated areas. The plans would encompass such laws as the Public Works and Economic Development Act, Model Cities Act, Manpower Act and the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

AGENCY OK NECESSARY

6. That under no circumstances will any planning or programs be considered, proposed or undertaken without the full approval and consent of BEACON or a similar agency responsible only to the black community.

7. That a variety of programs and proposals be submitted that will include construction of attractive and imaginative low-cost housing projects with businesses, shopping centers, educational clusters, recreational centers or any combination; also, the purchase of land by the city or Federal Government be made available to black businessmen first.

8. That all businesses to be rebuilt or constructed in the devastated areas be either under the ownership or management of Negroes. "Black entrepreneurship must be made a cardinal fact of any plans or program for these areas."

9. That young black people who live in the areas be made a part of planning and execution.

10. That Negro residents of the areas be given priority in all jobs in connection with demolition and construction.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 13, 1968]

SHOUTING FLARES AT CARDOZO MEETING ON RIOT RESPONSIBILITY

(By Lee Flor)

CHANGE, the anti-poverty organization in the Upper Cardozo Area, sponsored a meeting between businessmen and Cardozo residents yesterday that turned into a shouting match over responsibility for last week's disorders and what should be done.

First, organization members had to give up seats to the Cardozo residents. Later, after complaints about the presence of newspapermen and television reporters, CHANGE threw the press out.

Mrs. Ruth R. Webster, president of the executive board of CHANGE, had called the meeting at the group's offices, 3308 14th St. NW, in the heart of a burned-out area. The meeting was supposed to give residents a chance to tell white businessmen why their stores were burned during the civil disorders last week.

There were other reports that CHANGE officials expected neighborhood residents to

tell businessmen that "outsiders" burned the stores.

But Mrs. Webster said the meeting was formally called so residents could talk about "how do we rebuild 14th Street?"

"Do you want a liquor store on every corner and a tavern on every block?" Mrs. Webster asked the 30 persons crowded into the meeting room.

"What were the majority of Negroes saying when they burned your stores," she said, turning to the white businessmen.

Robert King, a volunteer worker for Calvary Methodist Church, was the first resident to speak.

"We need high rise apartments on the corners where the liquor stores were—we need low-income dwellings."

Then some of the persons in the back of the room pushed forward and started to give their opinions.

George E. Storey, representing a group called "Build Black" said "there needs to be more black businessmen." "Those lily-white businessmen should lend us the money to establish Negro businesses," Storey said.

If Negro businesses are not established, civil disorders will occur over and over again, Storey said.

Then Reed Scott, president of the Columbia Heights Businessmen's Association, spoke up.

"We have several Negro businessmen whose businesses were burned out," he said, and went on to mention several cases.

"They were a colored front (for white owners)," someone shouted.

Another crowd member shouted for a moratorium on all city planning and on all attempts to rebuild the burned out areas.

Mrs. Webster asked the crowd to "let us all plan together."

"You don't plan with cameras and newsmen present," crowd members shouted back.

The crowd went into an uproar, with individuals shouting at each other. One Negro businessman told a crowd member: "You don't own anything on this street but your big mouth."

"We'll plan this city with gasoline," another crowd member shouted.

Mrs. Webster asked the press to leave.

Scott later told newsmen that he did not believe the fires and civil disorders were racial in origin. He said he did not know if the businessmen would want to rebuild their stores in the area.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 11, 1968]

WORK ON CITY PROBLEMS, BARRY URGES COALITION

(By Paul Delaney)

A routine report meeting yesterday of the Washington Urban Coalition turned into a soul-searching session after several Negroes, led by civil rights leader Marion Barry, accused the group of losing sight of its goals and of discriminating against the very people it is supposed to help.

Barry interrupted the meeting after several minutes of self-praise by coalition members. He demanded the meeting get back on the track and be serious about solving immediate and long-range problems of areas of the city torn by disturbances.

The meeting did get back on course and the group adopted a resolution by Miss Flaxie Pinkett to look into the problems of persons being detained and awaiting trial. The coalition voted to set up a committee to investigate the matter of "unreasonable bonds" to see what the group could do about the situation.

DISLIKES TONE

Clad in Pride, Inc. green and wearing sunglasses, Barry told the gathering he didn't like the tone of the meeting. His arguments were spiced with some mild profanity that caused murmurs among the blue-ribbon members of the coalition.

Barry was upset as Safety Director Patrick

V. Murphy, with a nod of agreement from police chief John B. Layton, praised the patrolmen on the street during the riot, and another coalition member commended fire departments of neighboring jurisdictions.

"We have a very serious problem in our city, with millions of dollars worth of property damage," Barry stated. "Why do we go on patting each other on the back like a mutual admiration society when this thing isn't over yet?"

MAYOR SPEAKS

"It's not just the 6,300 people who were arrested, but a whole lot of black people in this town are angry and just waiting till the troops leave."

Coalition executive director Walter McArdle answered that when a man does an outstanding job he deserves credit.

Mayor Walter E. Washington, caught in the middle of the controversy, noted that the curfew and other measures taken are indicative of the seriousness of the situation. He praised the fact that the diverse group was engaging in good dialogue and "coming together" to handle the problems of human needs.

And without putting down Barry or chiding the business, civic, religious and professional leaders who make up the coalition, the mayor stated:

"This is what we're here for. We've got to address ourselves to those human needs. We've got to look at them in a different framework than in years past. The very fact that Mr. Barry can stand here and respond to the needs is what this whole thing's all about."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 12, 1968]

SOME U.S. EMPLOYEES FACE PAY CUTOFF IN RIOT

At least some federal workers face a cut-off of pay if they are convicted of such offenses as looting, burning and inciting to riot in last week's strife here and elsewhere.

The Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare have notified their employees they are required by law to impose the penalty in case of conviction of serious rioting offenses.

Curfew violation would not necessarily mean a salary cutoff, attorneys believed.

The penalty provision was specifically written into the appropriations bill for Labor, HEW and the National Labor Relations Board last year in a rider offered by Rep. Joel T. Broyhill, R-Va.

According to the rider, no salary may be paid to any employee convicted of inciting, promoting or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of federal, state or local laws designed to protect persons or property.

The law does not call for outright dismissal—but loss of pay might be considered tantamount to this.

It was not immediately clear how other federal agencies would proceed in cases of riot-connected convictions of their employees.

A Civil Service Commission spokesman pointed out that in screening persons for initial employment, the agency policy is to consider convictions on an individual case-by-case basis.

In a memo to Labor Department employees, Assistant Secretary Leo R. Werts noted that conviction of crimes not specified in the rider do not carry the same automatic penalty.

He noted also that a guilty plea is the same as a conviction.

Both HEW and Labor advised workers who are concerned about the provision to consult their own attorneys and legal offices of their agencies.

Labor Department Solicitor Charles Donahue explained that since the rider is in the appropriation act, "we felt it was our responsibility to call it to the attention of all the

officials of the department who might have employees who got involved in any of the recent disturbances in any of the cities of the country.

"We were equally concerned about the rights of the employees," he added, pointing out that they should be aware that guilty pleas might expose them to loss of pay.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 14, 1968]

BOARD EASES STAND: LIQUOR STORES TO GET AID ON BILL PAYING

District liquor store owners who suffered losses during last week's rioting will be given a break in meeting the deadline to pay for their inventories.

The Alcoholic Beverage Control Board announced yesterday that it would give special consideration to those hard-hit victims of the riots.

Liquor store owners are required by law to pay for each month's supply of alcohol by the 15th of the next month. In a series of meetings this week with the board, representatives of the liquor industry requested that owners who suffered losses be given special consideration.

Board member J. Bernard Wyckoff said the board reached an informal understanding with representatives of the industry.

TO BE RECEPTIVE

"We are perfectly conscious of their problems and we will do everything we can for those affected," Wyckoff said.

He reported that the "understanding" means that the board will be receptive to examinations by those dealers who were victims of looting and burning. Wyckoff noted that liquor stores were particularly hit hard during the disorders and that many dealers won't be able to replace their inventory and some will go out of business.

Wyckoff added that the board expects to receive requests from the store owners between now and May 15. He explained that the District has a very strict law concerning the purchase of liquor.

A 30-DAY GRACE PERIOD

"The liquor they buy from wholesalers must be paid for by the 15th of the next month," Wyckoff stated. "However, there is a 30-day period of grace."

"If the purchase is not paid for by then, the owners can't purchase any more alcohol except on a cash basis. The law is to prevent credit problems."

Wyckoff said the owners are required to inform the board when and why they can't meet their payments. The board then is required to consider a penalty, from a warning to suspension of operations. The latter "does their credit situation no good," Wyckoff said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 14, 1968]

WHO PAYS FOR GOODS LOOTED AT PAWNSHOPS (By William Grigg)

Six of the city's 13 pawnshops were badly damaged in last week's disorder and the pawned property of thousands of persons was destroyed or stolen, the president of the Pawnbrokers Association of Washington said today.

The president, Jerry Livingston, said the situation is "ironic, because some poor people leave TVs and other valuable items with pawnbrokers for safekeeping, as well as to secure a loan." He said a man living in a boarding or rooming house may pawn items, if he is going to be out of town a few days, so they won't be stolen.

About the only things left in some of the pawnshops were small, valuable items such as jewelry, they were in safes, Livingston added.

TOTAL OF \$250,000

Burned or stolen items may involve the pawned property of thousands of persons and may total \$250,000, he estimated.

Whether the pawnbroker is responsible for the losses is not clear. Some receipts for pawned items say the pawnbroker is not responsible if an item is lost through burglary, or fire, but it is not known if this is legally binding.

On the other hand, people who pawned items do at least have the money loaned them.

Livingston said the pawnbrokers are angry that police and federal troops "stood by" and permitted looting during a part of the disorder. He said some shop owners have talked about trying to sue the city for failing to protect them.

MANY SHOPS RUINED

Sparks Pawnbrokers at 1914 7th St. NW is nothing but rubble now, Livingston said. Others that were badly damaged or had much of their pawned items taken by looters, he said, were:

Royal, 3012 14th St. NW; Sam's, 1930 14th St. NW; Capitol, 1738 14th St. NW.; Morris, 1253 H St. NE. and Weinstein's, 313 H St. NW.

These six shops, which are regulated in regard to the amount of interest they can charge may loan \$200,000 to \$300,000 in a year to persons who leave items behind as security, Livingston said.

None of the pawnshops hit were owned by Negroes, but Negro employees were put out of work when the shops were hit, Livingston said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

HEARING I: SET ON PAWNSHOP RATE RISE

The Washington City Council last night ordered a public hearing before interest rates for the city's pawnbrokers are raised.

After an hour of debate, the council voted 5 to 4 to accept the recommendations of an ad hoc committee composed of Vice Chairman Walter E. Fauntroy and Joseph Yeldell.

The pawnshop item has been before the council several times. The council previously approved the rate increase at the urging of Julian Dugas, director of the Department of Licenses and Inspections. However, the council later named Fauntroy and Yeldell to study the issue.

The proposed rates would be 5 percent per month on the first \$25, 3 percent on the next \$175 and 2 percent on the next \$800.

These would replace rates of 3 percent per month on \$100, 2½ percent on \$200, 2 percent on \$500 and 1 percent on \$1,000. The rate of 8 percent a year on loans above \$1,000 would be unchanged.

In other action, the council approved a \$436,000 amendment to the 1969 budget to pay for space rental for the Departments of Highways and Traffic and Sanitary Engineering. The money would come from several funds in which financing of projects can be delayed.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

NORTHWEST HOUSING PLAN FUNDED: ARCHDIOCESE SLATES LOW-COST PROJECT (By Russell Chandler)

A pilot project to acquire and rehabilitate a number of low-rent houses in Northwest Washington with \$10,000 "seed money" from the Washington Catholic Archdiocese and \$137,000 loaned through the Federal Housing Administration was announced today by the archdiocese office of urban affairs.

The Redevelopment Land Agency today approved the transfer of nine houses to the Urban Rehabilitation Corp., a nonprofit organization composed of church, labor, education and other community leaders.

The corporation will engage Negro contractors and Project Build apprentice trainees from District vocational high schools to rehabilitate the houses—perhaps up to several hundred eventually—for the poor.

The Rev. Geno Baroni, director of the

archdiocese office of urban affairs, said the first phase of the project will be to renovate nine 4-bedroom row houses on K Street and New York Avenue in the Northwest 1 urban renewal area and turn them over to low-income families on long term, low-interest mortgages. Renovation is scheduled to begin May 1, he said.

Some 80 ghetto youths between the ages of 17½ and 24 will be assigned for six months to do this and other remodeling under the supervision of eight journeyman craftsmen. Project Build director Roland J. Williams said the youths will gain experience leading in building trades careers.

FIRST IN DISTRICT

Baroni said the rehabilitation project is the first in the District to be implemented under the 221-H housing program and that the new corporation is negotiating for "several hundred more houses to restore and make available to the poor."

The \$137,000 mortgage money has been supplied by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, with the FHA guaranteeing the loan.

Last week the Washington Lay Association, an unofficial group of Roman Catholic laymen, announced a major drive to raise \$1 million to subsidize home ownership for several hundred District low-income families. Senator Robert F. Kennedy, D-N.Y., was named chairman of that effort, which also is to make use of the 221-H housing program.

That drive has no official connection with the archdiocese, nor has Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, had any role in its organization.

TO CANVASS PARISHIONERS

The archdiocese-aided group, Urban Rehabilitation, was formed last July and its officers applied for the federal housing program assistance in December, according to Baroni. He said FHA and RLA pushed the application through "in record time."

Baroni said today the archdiocese "has pledged its support for an expanded program," but added that no immediate solicitation of area Catholics is planned. The Washington Lay Association canvass of 60,000 parishioners will be held the first week of May.

The Urban Rehabilitation project has sparked a joint effort by the Washington Area Contractors Association, the Central Labor Council, the area's vocational high schools and components of the Urban League.

Negro contractors engaged in small construction projects—and assisted by the Small Business Administration—will perform the work and Project Build will use its trainees for subcontracting.

Williams said the training will be done through a contract with the Department of Labor. He said this is the first time such an arrangement has been offered here.

TO GET \$56 PAY

"We will prepare and inform the boys and steer them into skilled trades," he said. Trainees will get \$56 a week until qualifying as journeymen.

The houses, when renovated, will sell in the \$15,000 range, Baroni said. This will mean families will pay about \$125 monthly, including all utilities, taxes, interest and principal. He said a typical mortgage payment will be \$92 a month.

The 221-H program makes housing available to a family of four whose annual income is no more than \$4,900, or a family of seven making not more than \$5,600.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

REMAINING TROOPS LEAVE CITY: ROAD BACK'S BUMPY NOW

(By Jack Vitke)

The City Council, which is scheduled to begin public hearings next Tuesday to get

citizens views about how the city's "long, hard road to recovery" is to begin, got a taste of what it will hear last night from Marion Barry.

Mayor Washington had called for "pulling together" earlier in the day as he announced that the remaining 5,600 Federal troops and National Guardsmen had been pulled out of the District, but it was doubtful that the recovery plans that he and his administration are formulating bear any resemblance to those advanced by Mr. Barry. Mr. Barry forced his way before the City Council meeting and finally was allowed five minutes by Council Chairman John W. Hechinger, who called the late "intrusion highly irregular."

HIS STORY

The situation Mr. Barry sketched was of a white society that had fled the inner city but still controlled the politics and business of the ghetto, enforcing what he called a condition of "gray flannel slavery." His figures showed that only four of the 200 licensed liquor dealers are Negro.

Mr. Barry discarded the findings of white sociologists—erroneous, he said, because Negroes often lie to them—and opposed the "business as usual" policy because it would carry out a trend which would "inevitably lead the citizens of the ghetto to destroy . . . society."

Instead, Mr. Barry asked the Council to stop processing special low-interest disaster loans to "exploitive" businesses and to give no loans to white businesses in the ghetto unless proprietors agreed to a plan which would lead to 51 per cent black ownership.

Earlier, Deputy Mayor Thomas Fletcher had said that the pattern of stores burned—credit companies, pawnbrokers, liquor, chain and clothing stores—showed "resentment for poor service and bad business practices."

SAME ROUTE

This pattern, identical to the one in other cities with riots, he said, was based on the "public image" of the stores and whether they were white-owned. Homes had been burned only when fires spread to them from stores, he said, and only eight public buildings had been destroyed.

The city would study the problem and try to devise "a better system of consumer protection," he said. He also said Mayor Walter Washington had asked the Administration for the "disaster area" classification that would permit special 30-year three per cent loans to rebuild businesses.

Mr. Fletcher said that he knew of no insurance companies cancelling coverage or holding up any payments. Asked whether any businesses were completely ruined, he replied, "It may be that the ruin was mental, not financial. That we can never rebuild."

The Urban Coalition's emergency relief actions showed "the fastest response in any area of the country," he said, but added that the real commendations will have "to wait until we see how well we have rebuilt."

MORE PRAISE

Several Council members praised the restraint used by police in dealing with rioters, and Mr. Fletcher called this policy "the only intelligent approach you could probably use." He said statistics showed that Washington was "no worse and in some ways better off than cities using other means."

That the Council members did not mention Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley by name, they were obviously adding their thoughts to the sharp nation-wide debate provoked by his ordering police there to shoot to kill arsonists and to maim or cripple looters.

New York Mayor John Lindsay led the opposition to Mayor Daley's remarks, saying, "We're going to respect human life . . . in short we're not going to shoot children in New York City."

New Jersey Gov. Richard Hughes told a conference of his state's mayors that looters and arsonists should be dealt with swiftly

and sternly—but by the courts, and not by being shot.

However, Joseph J. Lefebvre, president of the Fraternal Order of Police, praised Mayor Daley's "positive position," adding: "You have our deepest respect and admiration for the unequivocal stand you have taken with respect to the anarchy that is threatening to destroy our society."

EXPLANATION

Mayor Daley himself today said his "shoot to kill" order was "misunderstood and blown out of proportion," and that it referred only to "obvious arsonists."

"If they are burning the building down they should be shot," he said.

Gilbert Gimble, a District police department spokesman, said that a 1954 police regulation governed what happened here:

"Basically, it says the police service revolver should never be used because of a suspicion of a serious crime but only when the gravity of the situation would justify death or serious injury. And that means we're not shooting kids who are stealing some shoes out of a store window."

District Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy declined to direct comment on Mayor Daley's position, but said, "I think our policy of restraint is a good policy."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 14, 1968]

"WE DON'T HAVE A BUSINESS" THE STORY OF ONE RAVAGED BLOCK

(By Barry Kalb and Winston Groom)

"Thursday, my husband told me we were buying a new house. It was a big step for us," Mrs. Albert Schindler recalled a couple of days ago. "Friday morning, he called me up and said, 'Forget it. We don't have a business.'"

The Schindlers' dry cleaning plant on 14th Street NW was a blackened smoking mess, their machinery all but destroyed, their customers' clothes taken or burned.

The inevitable debates over the causes of last weekend's riot, over the actions of the police, over the timing of the decision to call in troops, over the extent and comparative severity of the damage—these debates will swirl irrelevantly over the heads of the Schindlers and their fellow merchants whose stores, perhaps whose life's work, have been looted and burned to the ground.

But all of the talk will not resurrect a going business from the piles of scorched timbers and ashes.

A Redevelopment Land Agency survey early last week showed that at least 645 buildings have been damaged or destroyed. These 645 buildings housed 909 commercial establishments.

Now that the last fires have been extinguished, the businessmen hit hard by the destruction have begun to survey their losses and decide what lies ahead of them.

Some merchants have been wiped out. Many will be able to rebuild, but the road back to financial solvency will be a long one. There is the problem of collecting insurance, and then finding someone who will reinsure them at prices that are not prohibitive. There is the need in some cases for loans to supplement insurance policies that will pay for only a portion of the damage.

There is the problem of how to live while the rebuilding is going on.

There is the problem, if they wish to stay in the same area, of contending with moves announced by Negro organizations to replace white merchants with Negroes in the inner city.

And there is the problem, if they do stay, of the residue of bitterness that will have to be soothed before any workable relationship between the merchants and the residents of the neighborhoods can hope to exist.

The damage was felt mainly in three areas of the city: 7th Street NW, 14th Street NW and H Street NE. This is the story of one block, the 3300 block of 14th Street NW, and

how the merchants of this block have reacted to the near disaster.

The 3300 block runs from Park Road on the south, where the Tivoli Theater is located, to Monroe Street on the north. Though by no means the worst hit block in the city, it is perhaps representative of the type of destruction wrought by the riot.

The shops on this block are typical of those found in the inner-city commercial district: a large clothing and specialty store, barber-shops, beauty shops, clothing stores, a liquor store, a jeweler, a theater, a bank and a bar.

There is a marked difference between the two sides of the block. The west side of the street houses white merchants almost exclusively, several of whom own more than one store. The stores on the east side, the Tivoli side, are for the most part Negro-owned or Negro-operated.

Every store on the west side, with the exception of the Riggs National Bank branch, suffered major damage. On the east side, "soul brother" signs mark a row of untouched front windows which runs almost the entire block.

Although the Negro ownership of these stores played a significant role in preventing their destruction, there is another factor which probably accounts in part for this: There is little in most of these stores that anybody would want to steal.

THE WEST SIDE

14th and Park Road—Riggs National Bank, Park Road Branch. The vice president in charge is Arthur McInnis. The bank has been there since 1922 and employs 14 persons, three of whom are Negro.

The bank branch itself suffered minimal damage, mostly from water used to put out fires in other stores. However, the Riggs Bank building which, in addition to housing the bank, occupies half the block and rents space to other merchants, suffered "substantial" damages, according to bank officials.

The officials would not disclose any estimate of the loss, but said that it was covered by insurance.

3306—Renay's Maternity Shop (uniforms and maternity wear). Owned by Albert M. Esses since 1953. It had two employees—both Negro, both residents of the neighborhood.

Renay's was both looted and burned. Esses carried \$20,000 to \$25,000 in insurance but he feels the loss will exceed that. He feels police protection "wasn't worth a thing," and that the military "should have been called on Thursday night."

He says he noticed the neighborhood was getting tougher every day but "never dreamed this sort of thing would happen."

Esses says he will probably rebuild but this time will install a central burglar-alarm system and metal gates for protection. He will carry his present employees on the payroll as long as he can and give them a couple of months' salary if he has to let them go.

3310—Midtown Stationery and Office Supply Co. Owned by Alfred Stein and open since 1952. There were 10 employees. The racial breakdown could not be determined.

The store was looted and gutted by fire, and Stein considers it a total loss. "I was wiped out; completely burned, completely looted," he says. He cannot estimate the financial loss yet, but figures his insurance will cover only 50 percent of the damage. "I am going to take a hell of a licking," he said.

Stein is one of the most bitter of the merchants on the block. He criticizes the city government for ordering the police not to arrest looters and feels the federal government was extremely inept in its handling of the situation. "I called the White House and pleaded with them to call out the military," he says. "We're weighing whether or not to sue the government for gross negligence."

Stein's plans are uncertain, but he is one of the few who seems to be considering leaving the neighborhood. He believes others will

follow. "I don't think the merchants will go in," he says. "That street is dead."

3314—Usona Shop (cards and gifts). Owned jointly by three white men including Robert P. Boyle who has been there for three years. The shop has been there for about 30 years and has six employees—four Negro and two white.

The store was looted and damaged by fire and Boyle estimates the loss at between \$12,000 and \$15,000. He feels insurance will cover about two-thirds of the damage.

He has talked with the other two owners and they are still not certain if they will stay on. "We've got to put this thing together and see what we can salvage," he says.

3316—Bob Inn (night club). Owned by James C. Powell, it has been there for 17 or 18 years and has 16 employees—all Negro. Powell's white.

The place was looted but not set afire. Most of the loss was in stolen liquor stock. George Farmer, the manager, estimates loss at about \$4,100 including some broken windows. They will reopen shortly but won't keep much stock on hand in the future.

3318—Harris Beauty and Barber Supply Co.—Owned by Irving Hoddes, opened in 1955 and has three employees. Hoddes is white and the employees are Negro.

The store suffered no fire damage but water leaked down from the floors above and caused considerable loss. "It was like a shower bath when we got in," he says. Windows were smashed and looting accounted for further losses.

In all, Hoddes estimates he suffered about \$12,000 in damages, \$10,000 of which is covered by insurance. He will probably reopen but he's waiting to see what his neighbors decide to do. "I'd hate to be the only store on the block along with a lot of burned-out buildings," he says.

3320—Nationwide Taxes (Income tax consultants). The office just opened in January and will close in April. It is undamaged except for a broken window in the rear and is still in operation.

3322—Melart Jewelers—Owned by Mel Foer and opened in 1964. There were three full-time employees (two white and one Negro) and one Negro part-time. The ownership is white.

Employees of the store managed to save some of the merchandise by putting it in the safe, but aside from that, Foer says, "all the fixtures, all the furniture, all the equipment was completely burned. The machinery was heated to the point where it melted."

He estimates the damage at between \$30,000 and \$50,000 and says insurance will probably pay for "close to what the losses are."

Foer was out of the country on Thursday, and didn't learn of the destruction of his store until two days later. He sounds more dazed than bitter. He praises his help.

Probably every merchant had loyal and faithful employees who, at the risk of their life, stayed behind to try to save things. And they came back later, during a lull, to take merchandise out. "I can't say enough for these people," he says.

Will he come back? "It's too soon to tell," he says.

3324—Sally Shops (women's clothing). Owned by Murray Braunstein for 10 years. He has four employees, all Negro.

The store was burned and looted. "They didn't leave a stitch," he says. He estimates losses at \$75,000, most of which he hopes to recover from insurance.

"I've never had much trouble before. The people had always been wonderful. It's almost impossible to believe you could be in a place so long with these people and know so little about them," says Braunstein, who is white.

Braunstein plans to rebuild if he can get insurance again. He feels the government should underwrite insurance in risk areas.

"If the insurance doesn't come through," he says, "you'll have a desert here."

3328—Speedy Liquors—Owned by George Rogers, his wife and Robert Harris, who are all Negroes. They purchased the store in September. There are three employees, also Negroes.

Speedy Liquors fared better than most liquor stores in riot areas, but damage and looting were still extensive. There was no burning except for part of one wall in the back that adjoins Morton's.

Quite a bit of liquor remains on the shelves, but Rogers, the only Negro merchant on the west side of the block, says about half the stock was taken or destroyed.

In addition, water leaking in from above caused considerable damage, particularly in the basement. He estimates his loss at between \$12,000 and \$15,000 and doesn't know how much of that was insured.

Rogers also seems bitter at the destruction. Obviously, he was not the target of racial hostility and he feels "you have a certain type of people waiting for the opportunity to do something like this. The people doing the looting were mostly people we had waited on."

Rogers will reopen. "We're going to have to reopen—we've got large debts and we have to make them up," he says.

3330—Morton's Clothing Store—One of a chain of medium-price clothing department stores owned by Mortimer Lebowitz and his brother, Leonard Leslie. The two men also own the building that runs from 3318 to the northern corner.

Ninety percent of about 90 employees are Negro, including assistant manager Beverley Gaskins and six others of the 10-man executive staff of the store which opened last August.

Lebowitz, who is white, has worked with the Negro community for many years. He was a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People when that was considered something of a radical organization. He was president of the Washington Urban League in the late 1950's and is presently on the league's board of directors. Lebowitz is proud of the fact that he marched with the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. into Selma, Ala., in 1965, and during the 1963 civil rights march here.

The store is almost a total loss. Lebowitz estimates the damage at about \$1.5 million (and about \$1 million at his H Street store, which was burned to the ground), but adds, "We're completely covered for our losses."

Lebowitz feels that the community has shared in the loss. He has made a point of hiring "as many indigenous people as possible." His employees were recruited by the Urban League at his request. They were trained on the job.

The community also has lost a type of store needed in the inner city, Lebowitz feels. "People kept coming in and telling us how wonderful it was that a store like this had opened in the area," he says.

He hopes to rebuild at both locations, and speaks of opening some sort of temporary stores during the interim: "I feel these areas have to be served."

THE EAST SIDE

3301-3329—Beginning with the Tivoli Theater, there are Maxwell's Barber Shop, managed by Thomas Maxwell; Fantasy Hair Fashions, a beauty parlor, managed by Nura Q. Amin; Pete's House of Styles, a beauty parlor, owned by Gladys E. Peterson; Peay's Variety Store, owned by Elmore Peay; Ace Sewing Center, owned by Mary M. Newman; Tivoli Barber Shop, managed by Cornell Brace Jr.; Arrow TV; a television repair and second-hand store, owned by Jack Gibson; Jean Muriel Originals, a wig and related items shop; an annex of Arrow TV; Specialty Enterprises, a wig and related items shop, owned by Jack Turner; Brevard Beauty Salon, owned by Thomasina Brevard; and a self-service laundromat.

Only the laundromat, which is owned by a white man was damaged in this group. Its windows were broken.

Some of the owners of these stores, perhaps feeling the "soul brother" signs they painted needed backing up, stayed in their stores to discourage looters. Turner, who carries a gun on his hip, said he had trouble with only one man. "A cat from outside the neighborhood tried to come in here," he says. "We flattened him."

John Davis, the head janitor at the Tivoli, said he and an usher camped out in the theater lobby to avert damage. "We know a lot of people in the neighborhood and we talked to them if they came near. We saved this place," he says.

Other owners left, but there was no damage. An employee of Arrow TV remarked: "The only reason they didn't hit this side of the block is that there ain't nothing here to take." Most of his stock was large, used console models.

3331—Beverly Cleaners—Owned by Albert Schindler and Sidney Gritz, brothers-in-law, both white. Opened by them almost 10 years ago, it has four employees, all Negroes.

This is the only store on the east side of the block that suffered major damage. Schindler says the building is probably salvageable, but most of the machinery and all of the clothing were lost. He estimates the loss to the machinery at about \$15,000, which will be covered by insurance. But the owners will have to make good on customers' claims out of their own pockets.

The two partners present a contrast in reaction. Schindler is extremely bitter. He feels that greater force including the shooting of looters, should have been used to stop the destruction. Gritz is more stoic in his acceptance of the damage, and recognizes that along with aid to the merchants, "something has to be done to help the Negro community."

Schindler says he would like to get out, but "I think we'll be forced back in. We have five years to go on our lease, and our landlord said he won't let us out of it."

Gritz says, "We're willing to come back if our customers will have us."

REACTIONS VARY

Reactions to the destruction, obviously, ranged from shock to acceptance to overwhelming bitterness. The bitterness was directed not only at the looters and vandals but at city and federal officials for their handling of the situation.

George Rogers recalled the scene in his store Friday afternoon, his face tense with barely controlled anger. "Young people were running in and out behind my counter, carrying out my whisky. Nobody stopped them. Nobody told them to stop."

"I asked a policeman why he didn't stop people. He told me he had to wait for orders."

Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy and special presidential liaison man Cyrus Vance have praised the police for their restraint in dealing with the rioters. But the merchants scoff. "That is ridiculous—restraint! How can you use restraint when criminals are running rampant?" Alfred Stein demands.

But most of the merchants conclude with a sigh of resignation. "Once it got out of hand, I don't think they had enough police to cope with the situation." However, to a man, they feel that the destruction could have been minimized by calling out the troops earlier.

TRAFFIC A FACTOR

Regular Army and National Guard troops were put on the alert late Thursday night, but were not actually called in until late Friday afternoon, and, slowed down by a massive traffic jam, were not substantially deployed in the primary riot areas until the early hours of Saturday morning.

"In my opinion, the White House is guilty of gross negligence in not providing protec-

tion for citizens," says Stein. "I'm very bitter."

Even when the troops arrived, orders for them to stop the looting were slow in coming through. Mortimer Lebowitz recalls, "Our manager asked a soldier, 'Are you going to let them walk out with all these things?' And the soldier said, 'Yes, I guess that's what we're supposed to do.'"

City officials have said that troops were not called early Friday because the situation appeared to have calmed after the initial violence Thursday night and Friday morning. At any rate, they argue, in spite of the presence of some 14,000 policemen and troops, there were still not enough men to stop the looting at the peak without the use of guns. And this was something they emphatically did not want.

"What are you going to do, start shooting little kids for stealing a transistor?" an official asked.

Animosity toward the Negro race was never expressed openly by the merchants, but was thinly disguised in some instances. One merchant suggested that if the presidential election were held now, "George Wallace would get a lot of votes here."

SHOCK MORE TYPICAL

But shock appeared to be the more typical reaction, and some merchants expressed a more understanding view. "I have no animosity toward the Negro race," said Lebowitz. "I have, if anything, a warmer feeling for my Negro friends, because they had to sit in the midst of it. I feel this is the responsibility of American society."

Rogers, a Negro, is hardly mollified by pleas for members of his race. "This 'soul brother' business," he sneers. "One of my employees told a looter 'This place is owned by a soul brother,' and he said, 'I don't care 'who' brother you are.' After that, Rogers sat in his store with a pistol."

Why were some merchants hit and others not? The overwhelming reply from those who suffered was, "Because we're white." This is undoubtedly true, but it appears to be a simplification of the reasons for the destruction.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders states:

"... In some cases, rioters focused on stores operated by white merchants, they apparently believed had been charging exorbitant prices or selling inferior goods. Not all the violence against these stores can be attributed to 'revenge' for such practices. Yet it is clear that many residents of disadvantaged Negro neighborhoods believe they suffer constant abuses by local merchants..."

HOWLETT QUOTED

There are those in the area who have expressed this same belief. "White America has preyed on the Negro here," says Dr. Duncan Howlett, pastor of All Souls Unitarian Church, two blocks from the riot area. "The merchants tempt the people with eye-catching window displays and taunts of easy credit."

Bernardo Lloyd, a director of CHANGE, Inc., which has its office in the 3300 block, spent hours during the height of the riot trying to move people off the street. He agrees with Howlett's contention.

"Just down the street, I saw a pair of shoes in a display window for \$100. Nobody around here makes that kind of money."

Lloyd, who has lived in the areas for several years, says Negroes resent the business community because they've never been allowed to become a part of it. "Look around," he says. "Except at Morton's and a few others, community Negroes are hired only as porters or clerks or janitors—they're not even salesmen."

The merchants aren't the only ones hurt by the destruction. Some of the employees will get their jobs back, but many are pounding the pavement looking for a new job. One negro standing on the street said angrily, "They put 10,000 black people out

of a job. I don't have no job. They burned my place down."

"I got kids," he said.

A woman staring at the ruined shell of Morton's remarked: "This is a shame. I been in this neighborhood 25 years, and we never had a store like this here."

MONEY NECESSARY

Few of the businessmen on the block had full coverage on their losses, and extra money will have to come from somewhere. There is the possibility that some sort of emergency measures will be passed to aid victims of the riot. Another, readily available source of money is the Small Business Administration.

Eugene Waldron, of SBA, says that virtually every businessman hit by the riot will be eligible for the agency's Economic Opportunity Program, which provides long-term loans to "economically disadvantaged persons." Included in this category, Waldron says, are any merchants whose business plight is not their own fault.

If the determination of whether or not to stay in business is relatively simple, however, the decision on where to stay in business has been complicated by outside factors.

Bob Smith of the Redevelopment Land Agency explains that nobody, including the District government, knows at this time just what the future status of the primary riot areas will be. Some were slated for urban renewal in five years or so, but the riot has accelerated the timetable.

As Waldron puts it, "There's no sense in a man's going back into 14th Street if it's going to be razed within a year."

COUNSELING CENTER

A counseling center for businessmen has been set up at the Lincoln Temple Memorial Church, 1701 11th St. NW. Representatives of insurance companies, SBA, RLA, the Public Utilities Commission, the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity and the Small Business Guidance Center will be on hand to answer merchants' questions as best they can.

But Smith stresses that the purpose of the center will be more to gather information than to disseminate it, since no decisions can be taken by city and federal authorities until the extent of the damage and personal hardship is known.

The work must be carried out as quickly as possible, says Smith. "Somebody's got to go over this whole city and put something down on paper. Some determinations have got to be made."

There is considerable sentiment within the Negro community to have the white merchants leave the inner-city and have Negro merchants take their place.

The Rev. Channing Phillips, president of the Housing Development Corporation, said Friday night. "We cannot simply put up again the same kind of city that was burned down. We face both the great opportunity to try something new and the necessity of doing it so the whole tragedy is not simply repeated."

The businessmen, still smarting under their own losses, are apparently more concerned now about their own problems. At a meeting of businessmen who had suffered losses, held at the Montgomery County Jewish Center on Thursday night, Lebowitz was booed off the stage as he made a plea for understanding.

At any rate, some merchants, including Lebowitz, are determined to stay. Lebowitz remarked:

"I hope to keep my staff together and keep this going."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 14, 1968]

CAMERAS CLICK AWAY: SUNNY EASTER FINDS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RELAXED AMID THE RUBBLE

(By Duncan Spencer)

Two little Negro boys in their Easter best poked through the glass and rubble at Man-

hattan Auto on 7th Street NW. They picked up a headlight; an elderly woman waved her cane. "Nobody can't tell you nothing," she fumed, shaking her head.

Elsewhere on Washington's sunny Easter morning, 200 troops lined up outside the Armory next to D.C. Stadium waiting for breakfast at 7:30 a.m.

And the city's languid Easter afternoon was the time for the games people play at Dupont Circle; pretending to read the paper, playing chess on a bench, displaying bare and dirty hippy feet, arguing potent arguments, strumming the same three chords on a guitar over and over to an audience of none, hearing news on a transistor radio.

The heat in the air was swept away by zephyrs that scraped last year's brittle leaves along the streets and seemed to carry away the memory of the wretched events of the previous week.

But at the same time early churchgoers raised the strains of "Welcome Happy Morning Age to Age Shall Say," policemen were carrying the body of a 40-year-old Negro man, William P. Jeffers, from a burned-out basement in the 1500 block of 7th Street. He was the eleventh riot victim.

By noon, 7th Street NW and 14th Street NW were clogged with cars occupied mostly by white people, gaping at the scars of the riot they had heard so much about crawling along snapping photos, staring from behind dark glasses.

The sidewalks, even in the most ravaged blocks, were crowded with people, their black faces set off like inlay against vivid Sunday clothes and the lovely lillies children carried home.

Photographers were everywhere, their eyes up to the front of the buildings, picking the worst spots, standing back and shooting endless pictures of rubble, wreckage and broken glass, sometimes to the amusement of the residents.

"What's he going to do, put that in his scrapbook?" a man with a pair of toddlers said and laughed.

No one on the sidewalk seemed the least interested in telling a tourist about the riot, even if he was a senator, like Gale McGee, D-Wyo., who drove the 7th Street stretch at about 2:40 p.m. in his yellow convertible, top down.

But the conversations on the streets could have enlightened the sightseers. Some thought it was over for the summer. Others tried to explain why 7th Street was in ruins.

Nurhal E. Ward works at Carter's Amoco at 7th and O Streets, right next to the O Street Market, which somehow escaped being destroyed by the flames.

"Don't you think people will wait now and see what city hall does?" he asked. Carter's was struck even though Carter, the owner, is a Negro.

At 5 p.m. last Friday, Ward put the cash register in the back of his car, locked up the station, turned off the main gas switch, scribbled "Soul" on the window and took off.

Yesterday he was puzzled, he said, even though he feels a strong kinship with the people on 7th Street. "You got to understand the credit merchants—I don't feel no compassion for them." He noted that pawnshops and "easy" credit stores were usually run by white absentee merchants.

"When that man sees you come in that door, he sees you're a black man, he knows you gotta come there—there's always the feeling that something sneaky's going on."

More ominously, he spoke of a professional woman he knew (he called her "the Ph. D."), who would get gas at Carter's. One day she whispered to him while he was making change for her: "Damn it, burn it down, all of it."

"And she was making \$20,000 a year with her husband, both of them professional people," he added with a shrug.

Few yesterday were as philosophical or disturbed as Ward.

At 14th and T Streets NW, pictures of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in two large sizes were hawked, as well as lapel buttons with King's picture and the words "I Have a Dream." Violet ribbon was attached to the buttons.

Hains Point was the city's Coney Island all afternoon. Hundreds of soldiers had bivouacked on the west end of the golf course there, and soldiers stretched beneath the cherry trees.

The soldiers have lost the look of patient endurance they had worn through the crisis. Yesterday they strolled at the water's edge without their guns. They watched the sailboats, or the girls; but a few still patrolled in jeeps, sweating under their helmets.

White Washington relaxed, too, after days of tension and introspection. Visitors clamored as usual on the marble monuments, furtively picked the flowers, or wandered on the Capitol grounds.

In Georgetown young girls tripped the streets in sandals and bright skirts after church. The balloon man of Wisconsin Avenue was at his station near N Street. "If the children's happy, then everybody's happy—," he crooned.

Later, at dusk, from the treelined homes behind the busy restaurant section of Georgetown, the tinkle of glassware floated through the air.

From dim backyards and balconies came the song of laughter; one by one the lights came on from living room windows.

Undemocratic: The Way We Nominate and Elect Our President

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday evening, April 20, it was my privilege to be the guest of Local No. 340, Truckdrivers Union in South Portland, Maine, and to present my views on the undemocratic method by which we nominate and elect our Chief Executive. The need for reform is, in my opinion, obvious and urgent. There are, no doubt, numerous Members of this body who share my concern. In hopes that my colleagues will give serious consideration to the issues of reform, I am inserting the substance of my statement for their attention:

LIBERATING AMERICAN VOTERS

(By Congressman WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY)

Electoral college reform will have little meaning if unaccompanied by reform in our procedures for nominating presidential candidates. The path to the Presidency begins when each state picks its delegates to the National nominating convention. In the fifty states, there are fifty different systems for accomplishing that task. Generally, however, there are two ways, either selecting the delegates through a State convention or committee process—or via the primary, a direct vote of the whole party membership.

While only 16 states have primary contests, from March through the summer of every national election year, all the attention is focused upon them. In only six of these states are the delegates legally bound by the results of their respective primaries. In four states, the delegates may run uncommitted and in the remaining five states and the District of Columbia, primaries have no legal bonds over the delegates to the National convention. Only about two of every five dele-

gates to each party national convention has been chosen through the primary procedure. I recently read a good summation of our primary procedure—The first thing to be said is that primaries are important because of all the fuss made over them.

Unfortunately, the State convention process lends itself more readily to undue influence than the primary system. The convention procedure lends itself to other movements which inhibit the democratic process even more. Favorite son movements have become a popular means by which to restrict delegates by holding them to that candidate through the first ballot of a convention which is oftentimes the final and conclusive ballot. The unit rule device inhibits free choice by requiring all of a state's delegates to abide by a majority of its membership vote.

With the advent of television, the National nominating convention itself has become a spectator sport. The majority of Americans sit on the sidelines and watch—while others eliminate all but two men from the Presidential race. Watching this event has become almost as exciting as football contests on New Year's Day. Like football, most Americans observe rather than participate. Unlike football, the outcome of the contest directly affects every overserver and nonobserver. That makes all the difference and that is why Americans must be given a greater, more direct and more meaningful participation in the nomination and subsequent election of the President.

Party nominees should be chosen by votes of all concerned citizens through a national primary election—rather than by State delegations at National conventions.

The electoral college and the need for its reform should be discussed now—because it is difficult to attract interest in reform when we are not face to face with a Presidential election. Under the present system, the American people vote indirectly by signifying a choice for an "elector" who is pledged—but as evidenced in 1960, apparently not bound—to support the party nominee. We are necessarily made more aware of the defects of the system now because we are approaching the national election. We think in terms of winning individual votes to elect the President but we should not ignore the fact that individual votes do not elect a President. Let us be aware of the possibility that the electors we choose to do our voting may "not" register our choice. The last President elected by a minority of the popular vote cast was to our benefit and good fortune. (John F. Kennedy received 49.48% of the popular vote to 49.23% for Mr. Nixon.) The next one could lead to our downfall.

As we approach this election and expend our energies to elect our Party's candidate, we should be impressed by the desperate need for liberating American voters. For so many years, we have tolerated an arrangement born out of the belief that the majority of our citizenry was too ignorant to make such an important decision as to determine the Presidency of the United States. There was a time when the American people were expected to tolerate that insult, but I don't know why they should tolerate it now. The inescapable fact that a man can become President without the support of a majority of American voters should warn us of the chance that we may someday suffer from our lack of concern for reform.

It has been pointed out by numerous historians that we have fortunately and sometimes only narrowly escaped the dire consequences which can result from the electoral college system but this is not a good argument for continuing the system. Perceiving the inherent defects, we must proceed to devise an instrument for the election of the chief executive which is consistent with our democratic beliefs. The President should be elected by direct popular vote.

One of the champions of the effort for

reform is our Senior Senator Margaret Chase Smith. Speaking before the Senate Judiciary Committee March 2, 1966, she stated, "The Electoral college is doomed to be replaced by the direct election system. It is only a matter of time. Its years are numbered." Senator Smith has actively pursued reforms since 1950.

Without enacting urgently needed election reforms, we live with the constant threat that someday, the Presidential Election will again be thrown into the House of Representatives. Imagine, if you can the catastrophe of a President so chosen, elected by States, each having one equal vote to represent its diverse interests and diverse population—whether large or small. Congressman Jonathan B. Bingham (D-N.Y.) has rightfully perceived the urgency of the matter and has introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would remove from the House the mandate to select a President when no candidate in the national election receives a majority of the electoral votes. The amendment provides for a runoff election between the two candidates with the greatest number of electoral votes if neither receives a majority. It also does away with the undemocratic system of unpledged electors.

While my colleague's amendment is applicable to the present electoral system, it would, I believe, adapt to a popular and direct vote system should we succeed in reforming the procedure.

I am hopeful that the Congress will respond to the need for these election reforms by adopting legislation providing for direct primary nominations of the major candidates, by abolishing the electoral college system in favor of direct popular elections and by taking the necessary steps toward amending our Constitution in accordance with Congressman Bingham's objective to preclude the possibility that the Members of the House of Representatives should have the power to choose the President of the United States.

In fine, we should make every effort to eliminate devices and procedures which tend to disenfranchise the American voter.

Greece

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of the junta's takeover, this week's Time of April 26, 1968, reports that Greece's economy has suffered a setback. While the "Old Fox" Papandreu remains under house arrest and his son and others are protesting the junta's rule, tourism has fallen off by 14 percent and foreign investment some 30 percent below the 1966 level. The article follows:

GREECE—A SORT OF CELEBRATION

"This year, the day of the Lord's Resurrection coincides with the anniversary of our people's crucifixion." (Former Premier George Papandreu.)

As the Greeks observed their Orthodox Easter, which the Julian calendar places a week later than in the West this year, they also marked the end of their first year under military rule. To celebrate the occasion, the junta planned military parades, ordered flags flown from every building and issued new gold and silver coins bearing its symbol: the shadow of a soldier against the background of a phoenix rising from the ashes. The regime of Colonel-turned-Premier George Papadopoulos hinted that it

would make some surprise announcements, perhaps including an amnesty for many of its 2,500 political prisoners, 100 of whom were released just before Easter. And, in an effort to ensure that the celebrations would not be marred by dissident voice, it placed under house arrest two of its bitterest critics, George Papandreu, 80, the leader of the big and now banned Center Union Party, and Panayotis Kanellopoulos, 66, the last constitutionally appointed Premier.

In Papandreu's case, the precaution did no good. Anticipating a crackdown, "the Old Fox"—as he is widely known in Greece—slipped out before his arrest a recording of a ringing anti-junta speech to Britain, where the BBC's Greek-language broadcast beamed his defiant words into sets all over Greece. In the eight-minute speech, Papandreu, who was Premier in 1963-65, called on the free world to boycott the junta so that "it will be worthy of the name." At home, he called on the Greek army to reassess its own support of the junta in light of the fact that the ruling colonels had produced no proof of a planned Communist takeover, their rationalization for seizing power. Under Greece's stern martial law, Papandreu's blast was tantamount to treason, but the junta took no further action against him for the time being, ridiculing his statement as a play for a return to power.

Economic Slump: Though the junta has brought stability to Greece and taken a certain number of sensible steps, it has little to celebrate on its first anniversary except its own dogged determination to hold onto power. The country is still ruled by decree, and the press remains under tight censorship. Because of the period of political uncertainty that preceded the coup, the Greek economy, which had been growing nearly as fast as Japan's, was headed into a recession even before the colonels seized power. Despite all sorts of pump-priming measures, such as the cancellation of \$260 million in farmers' debts to the state bank, Greece's economy remained in low gear.

Tourism fell 14% in 1967, and is off badly this year. The construction trade, Greece's second biggest industry after agriculture, has experienced a slump. Foreign investment has declined some 30% below the 1966 level. Though the junta has set Sept. 1 as the date for a plebiscite for a new constitution, few Greeks feel that the ex-colonels will step aside in favor of a representative government—though they may form their own party and permit elections if they think they are fairly certain of winning. Right now, talk of elections is extremely vague. Says Premier Papadopoulos: "You are asking the surgeon to plan out the patient's summer vacation two years hence, while he is still strapped to the surgical table."

Protest Movements: Strapped to the table as they are, Greeks at home either tolerate the junta's rule or feel that they are helpless to do anything about it. King Constantine remains in exile in a Rome hotel, with little prospect of returning to Greece soon; about his only public activity recently was to be guest of honor at an international karate contest in Rome's Olympic Village (he holds a black belt). Other Greeks abroad are not, however, so fatalistic; in city after city this week, they protested the military dictatorship. Actress Melina Mercouri, who has made opposition to the junta a second career, flew into London for a demonstration in Trafalgar Square, and similar rallies were scheduled for, among other places, Chicago, Montreal, Melbourne, Stockholm, West Berlin and Rome.

The biggest of all were planned for West Germany, where there are 160,000 Greek workers. One of the speakers there was to be Andreas Papandreu, 49, the Harvard-educated son of old George, who was released from a junta prison last December and has gone into exile to organize a resistance movement. Though the protest movements among

the Greek communities abroad are indeed unlikely to overthrow the junta, they nevertheless succeed in discouraging tourists to Greece and businessmen from investing there. In the long run, the ex-colonels may find those measures more difficult to deal with than with an outright armed uprising.

A Sad Easter in Greece

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Easter in Greece. It was also the first anniversary of the day American-made tanks were used by a small group of officers to end parliamentary government in Greece. The venerable George Papandreu, rightly predicting that the dictators would muzzle him on the occasion of the anniversary, smuggled out of Greece a stirring and eloquent statement—one that our Government should not ignore. Mr. Papandreu has since been joined in his appeal by the former right-wing Premier—Mr. Cannellopoulos—who is also under house arrest. Mr. Cannellopoulos addressed his appeal to the West to cease all support to the junta, through British Members of Parliament who met with him last week.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Papandreu's opening sentence must have caused many secret tears in Greece as his well-known but aged voice said:

This year, the day of the Lord's Resurrection coincides with the anniversary of our people's crucifixion.

The people of Greece rely on the BBC for news just as they did during World War II. The BBC has now done them another great service by making it possible to hear the voice of one of their most beloved leaders, who at the age of 80 is still so feared by the military junta that they cut his telephone wires and put him under house arrest, as Easter approached.

Mr. Speaker, I place the New York Times front page news story as well as the text of Mr. Papandreu's smuggled speech to his people in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 1968]

TEXT OF THE APPEAL BY FORMER PREMIER PAPANDREOU OF GREECE

(ATHENS, April 17.—Following is the text of a statement by George Papandreu, former Greek Premier, who is under house arrest, as received by foreign correspondents:)

This year, the day of the Lord's Resurrection coincides with the anniversary of our people's crucifixion. The military coup of the 21 April has abolished all freedoms. It has abolished the freedom of the press. Newspapers are not merely censored; they are actually being written by the personnel of the junta. Their contents are uniform; only the headings are different.

It has abolished the freedom of speech. No one may utter a word of criticism. He who does is at once committed for trial before a military tribunal. And the military tribunals impose sentences of long-term imprisonment. In fact, even without uttering a word, thousands of citizens are arrested and deported to desolate islands, under strict police surveillance.

They have abolished the freedom of assembly. Even the meeting of a few people is a crime, subject to trial by military tribunal. The junta alleges that it has restored order. But this is not "law and order." It is not the order of free men. It is the "order" of fear, the order of military tribunals. And this is a common characteristic of all totalitarian regimes.

In order to justify the coup d'état, the junta has manufactured a myth—the myth that a Communist revolution was to be launched during the elections of May 28, 1967 and that they had resorted to the coup in order to forestall it. "The country's salvation is the supreme law," they said. And they themselves hastened to become the "saviors."

The country's salvation is indeed the supreme law—but only if it is in danger. No such danger existed. As everybody has admitted since, the Center Union, the country's greatest democratic party, would have emerged almighty from the election of May 28. And the Center Union, as we have declared repeatedly, was both ideologically independent and politically self-sufficient.

The truth is that the myth of the Communist danger was manufactured and the coup undertaken only to prevent our electoral victory.

And the full proof that there was no danger of a Communist revolution has been offered by the junta itself. For a whole year, the junta has been carrying out investigations and has failed to discover even a single weapon, either among the democratic camp or even among the Communists. Not a single weapon.

How, then, could a revolution be launched by an unarmed people against a fully armed state? Only idiots could still believe this myth.

The junta now declares that it has taken up the country's rebirth. It denounces the "corrupt" past. And yet, never before, not even during the worst period of parliamentarianism, has there been such demagoguery and such favoritism. All those who had been voted into office have been dismissed without exception: mayors and members of municipal councils, the members of the governing bodies of cooperative societies, and lawyers' and doctors' associations and in general, the occupants of any elective office whatever. They have been replaced by relatives and favorites, whose main task is to send off telegrams of gratitude and to organize welcoming parties. And thousands of honorable officers and civil servants have been arbitrarily dismissed.

USE OF LIES CHARGED

The junta first made use of a big lie in order to seize power, the lie of an impending Communist revolution. And now, it employs another lie in order to stay in power. It used the fraud of the forthcoming plebiscite and of elections in the indefinite future. A plebiscite on the new constitution is to take place on Sept. 1. No one knows yet what this new constitution will be. A dictatorship drawing up the constitution for a democracy! It is an absurdity.

In the meantime, this dictatorship keeps publishing in the press articles of a draft constitution prepared by a committee asking for a people's opinion. In exchange for the complete abrogation of the constitution, the junta now offers the people the study of a constitution. This is adding mockery to tyranny. But this is not all.

The people are invited to take part in the plebiscite, while being fully aware that, whatever its outcome, the junta will still be in power tomorrow. And, having pinpointed its "valiant" opponents—for everybody is an opponent—the junta will reform them by imprisonment and deportation. Such will be the "free expression" of the people's will.

I now address myself to the country's armed forces. I understand their special sensitivity in matters of national concern, which explains why, on April 21, 1967, they were

misled by the great lie that a Communist revolution was impending. But now the lie has been uncovered. There had neither been, nor is there now, danger of a Communist revolution. Yet the junta is still in power. Why?

And now I address myself to the free world. We had hoped, after the Second World War, that Fascism had been definitely crushed and that it would not be able to make its appearance again, at least not in Europe. And yet it did. It is to our shame that its first reappearance should have taken place in our country, Greece, the cradle of democracy.

However the fate of the junta will not remain a local affair. Its fate will set a precedent, which will either encourage or disappoint, would-be dictators in other countries.

That is why I appeal to the free world, to its peoples and governments. We ask their solidarity and support. We do not ask for interference in our international affairs. But they are entitled to determine their own policy. And international isolation, both political and economic, of the junta will lead to its immediate overthrow. And that is what we appeal for in the name of the enslaved Greek people who we represent.

By taking such an initiative, the free world will both honor and protect itself. It will become worthy of its name.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 1968]

PAPANDREOU ASKS WORLD BOYCOTT TO TOPPLE REGIME—EX-PREMIER OF GREECE DEFIES HOUSE ARREST AND MARTIAL LAW TO ISSUE STATEMENT

ATHENS, April 17.—Former Premier George Papandreou defied house arrest and martial law today to appeal to the world for help in toppling the army-backed Greek regime.

The octogenarian leader of the Center Union party was put under house arrest on Monday to stop him from denouncing the regime, which on Sunday will mark its first year in power.

In a statement that reached foreign correspondents tonight, Mr. Papandreou called for an international political and economic boycott that would lead to the junta's overthrow.

He stated that what he asked of the free world, its peoples and their governments was solidarity and support. "We do not ask for interference in our internal affairs" he said, but they are entitled to determine their own policy. And international isolation, both political and economic, of the junta will lead to its immediate overthrow.

The house arrest of former Premiers Papandreou and Panayotis Canellopoulos, the rightist leader of the National Radical Union, Monday night, was part of a bid by the regime to prevent farmer leaders from issuing hostile statements while the regime celebrates its anniversary.

ANOTHER EX-OFFICIAL DETAINED

Demetrios Papaspyrou, president of Greece's last Parliament, was also placed under house arrest today after having refused to retract statements critical of the regime made to foreign newspapers.

Anghelos Angelousis and Efstathios Anthopoulos, Center Union Deputies, were arrested and the authorities prepared to deport them to the Aegean Islands.

Mr. Papandreou's statement referred to the coincidence of the regime's anniversary Sunday with the Orthodox Easter Sunday. It said: "This year the day of the Lord's Resurrection coincides with the anniversary of our people's crucifixion. The military coup of April 21 has abolished all freedoms."

The statement attacked the Greek rulers for having seized power under false pretenses—on the assertion that they were averting a Communist coup.

It said that for an entire year the junta had searched and investigated but had failed to find even a single weapon.

General elections were to have been held in Greece on May 28, 1967, five weeks after the military seized power.

Mr. Papandreou's statement derided the regime's contention that it was cleansing public life.

"Never before, not even during the worst periods of Parliamentarianism, has there been such demagoguery, such favoritism," the statement said. "All elected officers were dismissed without exception, to be replaced by relatives and favorites whose main task is to send off telegrams of gratitude and to organize welcoming parties."

Mr. Papandreou charged the regime with having added mockery to tyranny by staying in power on the pretext it had to hold a plebiscite on the new constitution and elections in the indefinite future.

It said that Mr. Papandreou had understood the susceptibilities of the armed forces in matters of national importance and this explained why on April 21, 1967, the troops were "misled by the great lie" that a Communist revolution was impending.

COULD BE TRIED

The statement added that the "lie" had been uncovered, but it asked why the junta was still in power.

Under the present martial law, Mr. Papandreou's defiance could bring him before an extraordinary court-martial. Five-year jail terms have been dealt out by military tribunals for lesser offenses.

This was the first major political statement by Mr. Papandreou, who was Premier of Greece from March, 1964, to July, 1965, as leader of the nation's biggest political party, since his arrest on April 21, 1967, the night the military seized power.

After detention in a hospital, Mr. Papandreou was sent home but was placed under strict confinement. His detention was lifted on Dec. 23, after Premier George Papadopoulos had granted an amnesty for political offenses. Then came the house arrest on Monday.

A spokesman for the regime said that Mr. Papandreou and Mr. Canellopoulos were "engaging in excessive political activity that might disturb public order and security and might involve them in unpleasant adventures."

BBC BROADCASTS STATEMENT

LONDON, April 17.—The British Broadcasting Corporation tonight carried the voice of Mr. Papandreou and his defiant words to the Greek people. His statement was broadcast in the Overseas Service of the B.B.C.

A tape recording was smuggled out to London. The B.B.C. would not disclose any details, but it was reported here that Mr. Papandreou got the tape out before he was put under house arrest on Monday.

Danger on the Horizon for the Small Broadcaster

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending in the other body a proposed amendment to the copyright revision bill which would require an additional payment by broadcast media every time a record is broadcast. Such a proposal, if implemented, would no doubt double the costs of doing business—particularly of small radio stations. It is obvious to me that recording artists are already benefiting from the exposure of

their songs to the public by radio stations. In fact, if it were not for that exposure, many of those same recording stars would still be trying to "make it in the big time."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider that latest assault against the small radio stations.

Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, a striking new museum on the campus of Springfield, Mass., College just a few miles away from the site where Dr. James Naismith invented basketball, was formally dedicated last Tuesday afternoon.

Several hours later the hall of fame held its first enshrinement dinner, an event honoring four basketball greats newly elected to the hall: Howard G. Cann, Clair F. Bee, Amory T. Gill, and Alvin F. Julian.

I had the honor of addressing the hundreds of celebrated athletes, coaches, officials, and writers gathered in the hall of fame for the afternoon dedication ceremonies. It was a signal honor, Mr. Speaker, because the Naismith Hall of Fame is the finest sports museum in the United States. In scope, in beauty, and in sheer physical size it surpasses the Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, N.Y., and the Professional Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio. Unlike these two museums, the Naismith Hall of Fame is dedicated to the totality of the sport it represents. Its exhibits recognize all aspects of basketball—the game's humble beginnings in the Springfield YMCA School For Boys, its slow spread into amateur athletics, its astonishing growth over the past decade into a multimillion-dollar professional sport.

John Bunn, a member of the hall of fame and chairman of its honors committee, pointed out at Tuesday's dedication ceremonies that the museum "surpasses the expectations of any of those who had something to do with it."

Tracing the events leading up to the construction of the hall of fame, Mr. Bunn neatly summed up the basketball world's attitude to the museum by calling it "a dream come true."

Basketball's famous teams and players, of course, are prominent among the individuals and groups honored in the hall of fame. But the game's coaches, officials, innovators, writers, and historians are also given the attention they deserve. Of the four men enshrined in the hall of fame last week, for example, three have earned this honor for coaching and one for innovations and writings that helped shape the game. Here are brief biographies of these four basketball immortals:

CLAIR F. BEE (1900—) ELECTED 1967—
CONTRIBUTOR

Graduated from Grafton, West Virginia, H.S. 1917, B.A. from Waynesburg College 1925, and M.A. from Rutgers 1932, Coach 29

years. Lost 7 games in 5 years at Rider, won 95% of games at Long Island University 1931–1952, including 43 straight. Undefeated teams 1936 and 1939. NIT Champions in 1939 and 1941. Baltimore "Bullets" 1952–54. Member All-American Selection Board. Traveled and lectured extensively abroad. Rules Innovator including "3 Second" and "24 Second" Rules. Prolific writer including 5 "Clair Bee" books in 1935 and many books and articles that remain valuable references. Received many coaching awards around the world.

HOWARD G. CANN (1895—) ELECTED
1967—COACH

Graduated from New York (Commerce) H.S. 1913 and New York University 1920. Great three sport athlete in high school and college. Member 1920 Olympic team. Led N.Y.U. to National AAU Title 1920 as its "Greatest All-Round Athlete." Coached at N.Y.U. 35 years. Teams won 409, lost 232. Coach of Year 1947. East Coach 1948. Received N.Y. Writers Distinguished Service Award. NABC Merit Award 1967. Coached many great players in outstanding coaching career.

AMORY T. GILL (1901–1966), ELECTED 1967—
COACH

Graduated from Salem, Oregon, H.S. 1920 and Oregon State University 1924. Captain and twice All-State 1919 and 1920. All Conference and All-American 1924. Coached 2 years at Oakland, California, H.S.; 36 years at Oregon State where he won 599 games. Won Pacific Coast Title 5 years, Far West Classic 8 years. Fourth in NCAA Tourney 1949 and 1963. Olympic Trials Coach 1964. NABC West Coach 1964. "Slats" was NABC President, 1957–58.

ALVIN F. JULIAN (1901–1967), ELECTED 1967—
COACH

Graduated from Reading, Pennsylvania, H.S. 1919 and Bucknell University 1923. Won 12 letters in high school and 10 in college. After playing pro football and baseball, began 41 years coaching 3 sports at various times. In Basketball won 381 games at Albright, Muhlenberg, Holy Cross, Dartmouth, and the Boston Celtics. Teams were in 5 NCAA Tournaments and 2 NIT Tournaments, won NCAA Title for Holy Cross in 1947. Won 3 Ivy Titles at Dartmouth 1956, 1958, 1959. Boston Writers Coach of Year, 1947; Philadelphia Writers Award, 1966. Coach NABC West Team 1965. NABC Merit Award 1967. "Doggie" was NABC President, 1966–67. NABC Metropolitan Award 1967.

The program for the enshrinement dinner honoring these men was as follows:

PROGRAM

GORDON CAMERON—GENERAL CHAIRMAN
(President, Farm Credit Banks of
Springfield)

1. Invocation, Rabbi Herman E. Snyder.
2. Dinner.
3. Introductions, Mr. Cameron.
4. Master of ceremonies, Curt Gowdy, NBC-TV.
5. Alvin F. Julian Award to a New England basketball coach, Edward Markey, Pres. New England Basketball Coaches Assoc.
6. Enshrinement ceremonies:
 - A. Joe Lapchick presenting Clair F. Bee; Nat Holman presenting Howard G. Cann; Forrest Twogood presenting Amory T. Gill; Henry Iba presenting Alvin F. Julian.
 - B. Presentation for enshrinement: John Bunn, chairman, Hall of Fame Honors Committee.
 - C. Clifford B. Fagan, president, Hall of Fame Board of Trustees.
 - D. Clair Bee on behalf of enshrines.
 - E. Recognition of Hall of Famers.
 7. Hall of Fame prayer, Rev. H. Hughes Wagner.

8. Principal address, Adolph Rupp, basketball coach, University of Kentucky.
9. Benediction, Rt. Rev. Timothy J. Leary. Music by Ted Lockwood Orchestra.

The program for the hall of fame's dedication ceremonies:

NAISMITH MEMORIAL BASKETBALL HALL OF FAME: DEDICATION PROGRAM 3 P.M., APRIL 16, 1968, PRESIDENT CLIFFORD FAGAN, PRESIDING

I. Invocation: Rt. Rev. Timothy J. Leary.
II. Introductions: Hall of Fame Trustees Hall of Famers.

III. History of Hall of Fame: John Bunn.
IV. Springfield, the home of the Hall of Fame; Rep. Edward P. Boland.

V. Dedication prayer: Rev. H. Hughes Wagner, Pastor, Trinity Methodist Church.

VI. Announcements.

VII. Benediction: Rabbi Herman E. Snyder.

I know my colleagues join me in wishing every success to the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, to its president, Clifford Fagan, and to its director, Lee Williams. The hall is a fitting monument to basketball—the world's most popular sport and the only major sport conceived wholly within the United States.

The Springfield Union last Wednesday published an article on the hall of fame's dedication ceremonies and enshrinement dinner. With permission I insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

HOOP HALL OF FAME ELECTEES ENSHRINED

(By Jerry Radding)

CHICOPEE.—Basketball, which once had to fight for recognition as a major sport, won its most glorious victory here Tuesday night just a few miles from where the game was invented.

The momentous occasion was the first enshrinement dinner of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame. Special honors were conferred upon four new electees, Clair F. Bee, Howard G. Cann, Amory T. (Slats) Gill and Alvin F. (Doggie) Julian.

FORMAL DEDICATION

The Hall of Fame building, situated on the Springfield College campus, was formally dedicated in an afternoon ceremony. The showcase of basketball was opened in February.

When these events were in the planning stage months ago, Hall of Fame executive director Lee Williams remarked: "This will be basketball's finest hour."

The 500 in attendance, which included many of the men of high rank in the hoop field, must have agreed.

Bee, coach of the famed Long Island University Blackbirds and a prolific writer of books on the game, was presented for enshrinement by Hall of Famer Joe Lapchick.

Cann, coach at New York University for 35 years and a member of the 1920 Olympic team received his honors from Nat Holman, another old Hall of Fame member.

ON ORIGINAL CELTICS

Holman and Lapchick both were members of the original New York Celtics.

Forrest Twogood, assistant athletic director at Southern Cal, made the enshrinement presentation to Gill, late coach and All American at Oregon State. Mrs. Amory Gill made the acceptance.

Making the enshrinement address to Julian was Henry Iba, immediate past-president of the National Association of Basketball Coaches. Mrs. Alvin Julian accepted honors for her late husband, who had a distinguished coaching career at Albright, Holy Cross, Dartmouth and with the Boston Celtics.

Another highlight of the dinner was the awarding of the Alvin F. Julian Bowl by the

New England College Basketball Coaches Association. Recipient was Rick Wilson of Amherst College, who just completed his 20th season as head basketball coach.

Ed Markey, president of the New England group, made the presentation.

RUPP MAIN SPEAKER

Adolph Rupp of Kentucky, winner of four NCAA championships and 23 Southeast Conference crowns, was main speaker. Rupp is an energetic member of the Hall of Fame board of trustees.

Curt Gowdy, popular sportscaster who admitted that he landed his first job in basketball, was master of ceremonies. Gowdy deviated briefly to baseball before getting to the business at hand.

Eighteen of the 35 living Hall of Fame electees attended the dinner. Those appearing besides the new electees were Holman, Lapchick, Ken Loeffler, Chuck Hyatt, Bob Kurland, Branch McCracken, George Mikan, Col. John Roosma, Bernhard Borgmann, John (Honey) Russell, John Bunn, Bill Mokray, A. A. Schabinger, David Tobey, Andy Phillip, and Barney Sedran.

General chairman of the dinner was Gordon Cameron, president of the Farm Credit Banks of Springfield.

Opening greetings were delivered by Mayor Frank H. Freedman of Springfield, President Wilbert E. Locklin of Springfield College and Melvin Holstein, president of the Joint Civic Agencies.

STEEPED WITH SENTIMENT

Clifford B. Fagan of Chicago, president of the Hall of Fame, presided at the dedication program, which was steeped with sentiment and nostalgia.

Speakers were U.S. Rep. Edward P. Boland and Bunn, a Hall of Famer and chairman of the honors committee.

"Built into these walls is the spirit of our country, since this is a truly American game," said Cong. Boland. "This Hall of Fame will do much for the city, Springfield College and the game of basketball."

Bunn, who once coached basketball and served as athletic director at Springfield College, traced the history of the Hall of Fame from its humble beginnings in the 30s to the present.

CREDITS EARLY WORK

He credited the early work of Dr. Forrest C. (Phog) Allen, the late Dr. Edward J. Hickox of Springfield College and the National Association of Basketball Coaches for helping to make the shrine a reality.

"This building epitomizes the life of Dr. James Naismith," said Bunn. "It's the saga of a man and his game."

"It's a dream come true. What we have here now surpasses all expectations of any of those who had something to do with it."

Following the building dedication the plaques of the four new electees were unveiled in the honors court. There now are 66 individuals and four teams in the Hall of Fame.

Members of the clergy participating in the dedication and enshrinement ceremonies were Rt. Rev. Timothy J. Leary, Rabbi Herman E. Snyder and Rev. H. Hughes Wagner.

Council Work Recognized

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable BOB SIKES, and I have worked for some time with the several counties in northwest Florida in developing the Northwest Florida Development Council.

We think this organization is going to add tremendously to the initiative of those counties in improving their economic well-being. I am happy to enclose a very fine editorial from the Graceville News of April 18, 1968, regarding the council's work:

COUNCIL WORK RECOGNIZED

Significance of events during the past weekend can only be guessed at right now, but doors are opened to what could be one of the most exciting and far-reaching programs in the history of the Florida Panhandle.

The Northwest Florida Development Council (NWFD) officially received its certificate of designation as an instrument to handle programs under the Economic Development Act (EDA).

This, in itself, may not sound too exciting because we all have known of the existence of the Council since it was formed, and in some general way of the work it was to do. It was charged, very simply, with "developing" Northwest Florida—at least, the ten counties in the council, and they comprise the major part of the geography of the Panhandle.

But this is not just another Chamber of Commerce, or Committee of 100, or other such organization. As important as these agencies are in their own localities, the new Council will work with a concept new to this area, and relatively new in the country.

In the words of Dr. Bill Nagle, director of the Office of Development Districts of Economic Development Administration in Washington, D.C., the Council can "speak with a louder voice than ever has been heard from this area." This louder voice is to be used in defining and solving perplexing problems of unemployment, underemployment, sagging economies, recreational development, social and educational upgrading, cultural improvement, transportation—there literally is no end to the scope of its work. And it respects no county boundaries, no artificial lines which heretofore have separated neighbors and have served to keep local problems pretty well immune from solution.

One of the more exciting facets of the Council's work, now that its first phase of study and planning is over and it has received official designation, is the insistence that all people, of whatever station, of whatever political persuasion, of whatever race, become actively involved in the work of the group.

Nagle emphasized that this was not just another example of "committee work," that the justifiable pride members of the Council have in reaching this first plateau must be shared and honestly felt by those with most to gain, the economically depressed and educationally inadequate and culturally deprived. This, he said, is a major step forward for them, not for the Council.

We have long advocated the disregard of county lines and city boundaries in the overall progress of our area. We have been encouraged by such limited activities as the vocational-technical school in Chipley, which serves more than one county; by Chipola Junior College in Marianna, which serves more than one county; by Vanity Fair's plans for a plant near Graceville, which will provide employment for more than one county; by efforts for a tri-city airport, which will serve more than one county.

These are efforts destined to succeed, and no small part of their success is due to the inter-linking of interest and responsibility which transcends political boundaries.

Now officially designated, the Council can—indeed, is called on to—proceed with identifying specific areas of need, specific solutions and programs, and specific costs. Now working under the monitoring eye of the EDA regional office in Huntsville, Ala.,

the Council has a direct line to sources of funds which, properly used, can transform the beautiful but poor Panhandle into a beautiful, thriving, vital area, where jobs are available for those who want them.

To President DeVane Williams of Bonifay and other officers, directors and members of the Council we offer our sincere congratulations for this recognition they have achieved; we offer our thanks for their many hours of labor in our behalf; and we offer our complete cooperation in helping achieve that prosperous and industrious, healthful and happy "promised land" that awaits.

Once political subdivisions such as cities and counties recognize that as long as one person is unemployed, whatever his race, he is a drag on the economy of the area, and a liability on the tax burden carried by the productive. If those unemployed and underemployed can be made into productive, tax-paying citizens; if those uneducated and undereducated can be trained for a useful place in society, contributing their talents; if those with talent and education can be enticed to devote more of themselves to the cooperative effort, there literally is no end to the heights this area can climb.

Birthday Celebration of Queen Isabella

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, Monday, April 22, 1968, we celebrate the birthday of Queen Isabella of Spain. If this determined woman had not seen fit to support the voyage of Christopher Columbus this land of ours would have a far different history.

It is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several of the many proclamations proclaiming April 22 as Queen Isabella Day. The person to whom much credit should go for his work in setting aside this day to honor Queen Isabella is John Paul Paine of Washington, D.C.

John Paine's letter of April 4, 1968, and several proclamations are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 4, 1968.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND FULTON: As the creator of Queen Isabella Day in the United States, I am delighted to let you know that proclamations are beginning to pour in from all over the country. I have been overwhelmed by the generosity of so many Mayors, City Managers, Governors and Congressmen. And now millions will acclaim the Queen.

States like Alabama, Vermont, Maine, Florida, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Maryland and cities like Albany, Bronx & Buffalo, N.Y., Akron, Canton, Columbus & Youngstown, Ohio; Berkeley, Long Beach & Oakland, Calif.; Houston, New Orleans, Memphis, Detroit, Newark, St. Louis, Davenport, Iowa; Englewood, N.J., are just a few who have already issued documents honoring the Spanish queen. Some of the above have done so for the last three years as you know.

Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, we Americans should all want to honor Isabella's memory, because, had it not been for the shrewd intuition and calculated gamble of this daring queen, we might not be here today. History tells us that every other power of that day, turned the Navigator down when he approached them for financial aid.

You are to be congratulated, Mr. Fulton, for having introduced a bill better known as H.J. Res. 135, authorizing the President to proclaim April 22d of each year, as Queen Isabella Day in the United States. The above proclamations can only enhance its passage in the 90th Congress. I hope it is not left to die. Every Congressman and Senator is now aware of your Queen Isabella legislation.

Looking forward to hearing from you. . .

Sincerely,

JOHN PAUL PAINE.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR, STATE OF ALABAMA

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451-1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968:

Now, therefore, I, Lurleen B. Wallace, Governor of the State of Alabama, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in the State of Alabama and urge all citizens to mark this day with ceremonies appropriate to her honor.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and have caused the Great Seal of the State of Alabama to be affixed, done at the State Capitol in the City of Montgomery on this the 6th day of March, 1968.

LURLEEN B. WALLACE,

Governor.

ATTEST.

MABEL S. AMOS,

Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION, CITY OF DETROIT

Whereas, the enthusiasm and support of a single ruler led to the discovery of America and the resounding effect this discovery had upon the history of the world; and

Whereas this great ruler, Queen Isabella of Aragon and Castile, was the sole backer of Christopher Columbus, whose proposed expedition to the New World was contrary to the 15th century concept of the world; and

Whereas the shrewd intuition of Queen Isabella, as well as the financial support and risk taken by Her Majesty on behalf of Spain was responsible for uncovering the unknown riches of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the history of America has direct linkage to the birth of Queen Isabella on April 22, 1451

Now, therefore, I, Jerome P. Cavanagh, Mayor of the City of Detroit, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968 as Queen Isabella Day in Detroit and urge all citizens to honor this Spanish Queen who was instrumental in making the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World a reality.

Given under my hand and seal this 16th day of April, 1968.

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,

Mayor.

PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE MAYOR, CITY OF SACRAMENTO

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through the support from Queen Isabella (1451-1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968

Now, therefore, I, Richard H. Marriott, Mayor of the City of Sacramento, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968 as Queen Isabella Day in Sacramento and urge all citizens to honor this Spanish Queen who was instrumental in making the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World a reality.

Issued: This 15th day of April, 1968.

RICHARD H. MARRIOTT,

Mayor.

PROCLAMATION, CITY OF PROVIDENCE, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451-1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, That voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968,

Now, therefore, I, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., Mayor of Providence, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in Providence and urge all citizens to honor this Spanish Queen who was instrumental in making the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World a reality.

In witness whereof, I, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., Mayor of Providence, have hereunto set my hand and caused my seal to be affixed this 4th day of April, A.D. 1968.

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451-1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the Five Hundred and Seventeenth Anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968,

Now, therefore, I, W. W. McAllister, Mayor of the City of San Antonio, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, to be "Queen Isabella Day" in San Antonio, Texas, and urge all citizens to honor this Spanish Queen who was instrumental in making the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World a reality.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of San Antonio to be affixed this 4th day April, 1968.

W. W. McALLISTER,

Mayor.

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF FLORIDA

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451-1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968,

Now, therefore, I, Claude R. Kirk, Jr., by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in the State and urge all citizens to mark this day with ceremonies appropriate to her honor.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the Capital, this 7 day of March A.D., 1968.

CLAUDE R. KIRK, Jr.,

Governor.

Attest.

JIM ADAMS,

Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF MAINE

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451-1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968;

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in the State of Maine, and urge all citizens to mark this day with appropriate ceremonies and observances.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this Thirteenth day of March, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the One Hundred and Ninety-second.

KENNETH M. CURTIS.

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451-1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, That voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968;

Now, therefore, I, Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in the State of Maryland.

Given Under My Hand and the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, in the City of Annapolis, this 20th Day of March, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty Eight.

By the Governor:

SPIRO T. AGNEW.

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF MINNESOTA

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451-1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, That voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the found-

dations for contemporary American societies, and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism, and

Whereas, The five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968,

Now, therefore, I, Harold LeVander, Governor of the State of Minnesota, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as "Queen Isabella Day" in Minnesota, and urge all citizens to mark this day with ceremonies appropriate to her honor.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed at the State Capitol this twenty-first day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-eight, and of the State, the one hundred tenth.

HAROLD LEVANDER,
Governor.
JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, March 5, 1968.

HON. WILLIAM H. CLAYPOOLE,
House of Representatives,
Main Capitol Building,
Harrisburg, Pa.

DEAR BILL: As requested in your recent letter, I was happy to designate a Queen Isabella day in Pennsylvania, and the official pronouncement is enclosed for you to forward to Mr. Paine.

Thank you for bringing this to my attention.

With kindest personal regards,
Cordially,

RAYMOND P. SHAFER.

More U.S. Assistance for Latin America

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, during a recent series of meetings by the Foreign Policy Association, Dr. John Plank, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, presented some excellent insights on what we should be doing in Latin America in the next decade. He feels that Latin America offers the greatest promise for moving from a traditional to a modern society. Latin America is of the west, with values and aspirations similar to ours.

Yet, our similarities can lead us into a trap, and cause us to become complacent. The United States and Latin America, in Dr. Plank's opinion, are now pulling further apart, culturally and economically, and this trend must be reversed.

The United States tends to be crisis-oriented, responding to emergencies "with a good deal more zest and commitment" than we normally do. In Latin America political systems are very resistant to change. Hence the Communist threat can be put into a proper perspective and we should have "more time to build carefully and wholesomely in one cooperative endeavor with progressive Latin Americans."

Cuba, in Mr. Plank's opinion, is an unusual case, and should not worry us to any great extent, but in the coming years we will see more violence in Latin

America. However, this will be due largely to national and social concerns rather than Communist inspiration.

In Latin America, we should be thinking of \$20 billion a year in aid from public and private sources, rather than \$2 billion. Economic aid is not enough.

No amount of straightforward economic and financial assistance will achieve wholesome development in the absence of changes, marked changes, in the social and political dispensations.

Aid must be more imaginative, with more involvement of voluntary associations, business resources, and political organizations.

Also, we must commit ourselves to the attainment of meaningful participant democracies in Latin America. Peace, progress, and participation are the three elements of political development, and we should give preferred treatment to governments which have achieved or are conscientiously working to achieve meaningful participation.

The remarks made by Dr. Plank, as summarized above, deserve careful examination. The full text follows:

I want to consider with you several problem areas in inter-American relations which, I think, if more carefully attended to, might make possible much more fruitful cooperation between the two parts of the hemisphere than has been characteristic of the past. I do not want to suggest that inter-American relations are ever going to be easy—the power disparity is too great, the difference in life-styles between North America and Latin America is too extreme, some features of the historical record are too deeply etched in stereotyped ways, to make easy interaction in pursuit of common purposes very likely. But neither do I want to make a negative, a pessimistic projection. Of all parts of the developing world, Latin America, it seems to me, offers the most promise of making the transition from what has been labelled "traditional" to what we call "modern" status . . . for, however appalling may appear to us to be conditions in Latin America today, Latin America is still substantially farther along toward wholesome development than, I should think, are Africa, Asia, or the Middle East. Moreover, Latin America is of the west, western. For all that there are great differences between Iberian culture and Northern European-North American culture, still the values of Latin America are like our values, the aspirations of Latin America are like our aspirations. We can, in short, come closer to mutual understanding with Latin America than we can with peoples elsewhere in the developing world. These are relative judgments, of course, and I repeat that I am far from wanting to suggest that communication and understanding are or can be easy . . . our commonalities at the surface often conceal profound differences, cultural differences.

Now, it may be said that full appreciation of the dimensions and difficulties of the problems that perturb inter-American relations can discourage us, lead to an attitude of resignation and withdrawal on our parts from Latin America. I confess I occasionally come close to succumbing to that mood—when one looks soberly at the obstacles to effective cooperation, obstacles not only intrinsic to the Latin American situation but also those that are part of our own United States situation (our decision-making machinery, our own priority scaling of problems domestic and international.) I become, at least temporarily, mightily discouraged. That mood, however, is a function of my own impatience, a function of despairing of ever

finding a way of tackling all the problems at once. And it is a mood that passes. There are things to do, things that can be done—and progress, as conceived by anyone who is not an apocalyptic romantic, must be recognized to occur only at the margin, only incrementally.

Let me, then, run through a handful of topics that I think important in terms of our handling demands and challenges from Latin America during the coming decade more effectively and constructively than we handled them in past decades.

First, let us take a look at the notion that has in a sense underlain our Latin American policy for generations—what Prof. Arthur P. Whitaker has called "The Western Hemisphere Idea." That idea is now part of our national mythology, it being predicated on the belief that elements of geography, history, and ideology have welded the states of this part of the world into a special kind of community, different from and potentially superior to areas and peoples elsewhere. It is the Western Hemisphere Idea that is celebrated on Pan-American Day when we formally rededicate ourselves to the values of representative democracy, it is that idea which underlies the Rio Treaty of 1947 which geographically delimits this area and puts it out of bounds to extra-hemispheric powers. There is obviously much to the Western Hemisphere Idea—whatever may be its intrinsic validity, that people in the Americas both North and South do believe in it makes it a force to conjure with. And it gives us something to build on. The difficulty is that it tends to lead us to a distorted picture of both our relationships with Latin American peoples and our relationships with peoples elsewhere, particularly peoples of the Northern Hemisphere and Europe. In point of fact, the Western Hemisphere Idea is critically important, but important as an ideal to be achieved, not as a presumed fact upon which to predicate decisions and policy. I think that at present the United States and the states of Latin America are pulling further apart rather than growing closer together, whether one looks to the economic dimension or more broadly to the cultural one. That trend I think needs to be reversed, but it will be reversed only when we recognize the superficiality of much of what we regard as the bonds of inter-American unity. There is no absence of rhetoric about the inter-American community, no absence of formal institutions to embody and advance the interests of that community. What we need to do now is give substance to the rhetoric and to the formal institutions.

This brings me to a second point. We in this country tend to be crisis-oriented, we tend to respond to emergencies with a good deal more zest and commitment than we do to the long-term business of patient building, particularly in that which pertains to our international policies. It is, for instance, quite improbable that the United States would have embarked on the Alliance for Progress had Vice President Nixon not been spat upon and stoned in 1958, had Fidel Castro not assumed power in 1959, had we not been able to put the Alliance for Progress into an anti-communist perspective. For years now we have been told that it is "one minute to midnight" in Latin America. What I want to suggest to you is that the crisis mentality is the inappropriate mentality with which to approach Latin American problems during the coming decade. We have simply got to think, both as a government and as a people, in much longer time-perspectives in respect of building the inter-American community, achieving meaningful success for the Alliance for Progress, than we have done. It is not "one minute to midnight" in Latin America, if by that we mean that the region is about to explode into revolutionary violence or that the communists, however defined, are ready to spring into positions of power and to impose a totalitarian clamp

upon society after society. That there is suffering and that the suffering is increasing is true, that there are massive problems and that the problems are becoming more serious is true, that there are communists and that their number is increasing is true. But the power of tradition in Latin America is immensely strong, the institutional ruts—in many cases centuries old—are very deep and resistant, and the strength of the established forces (in oversimplified but widely accepted language, the oligarchy) is very great. We are not going to see collapse of Latin American political systems—they are oddly stable and resistant to change, whether that change be oriented toward totalitarianism or toward constructive democratization.

It would be deplorable if recognition of this fact should lead us to reduce our efforts to help Latin America through today's very difficult transitional phase. On the other hand, recognition of it should help us put the communist threat into proper perspective and it should be viewed by us as giving us more time to build carefully and wholesomely in our cooperative endeavor with progressive Latin Americans. We do not need to be stampeded into precipitous action, either dubious, crash projects under the Alliance for Progress or counter-productive activity in the name of anti-communism.

We in this country may be disappointed at the slow progress of the Alliance for Progress; but we can take—if we wish—a certain wry satisfaction from the fact that the totalitarians of the left and right are every bit as frustrated as we. Let me make this, the third point, a little more explicit. Cuba frightened us badly, and we have operated on the assumption that additional Cubas were not only possible but likely. (Fidel, of course, has operated on the same assumption.) But in crucially important respects Cuba was *sui generis* in this hemisphere. Cuba was a tight little island in that (a) it was an island; (b) it was highly developed by relevant Latin American standards with good transportation and communication, a fairly homogeneous population; (c) Batista was a peculiarly loathsome dictator while Fidel was a particularly and romantically attractive leader who probably deceived himself and certainly deceived the Cuban people as to his eventual orientation and goals; and (d) Fidel was able to export his opposition, most of whom of course left Cuba voluntarily. These are not conditions that are to be duplicated elsewhere. Also, I think it possible that we during the years ahead will misinterpret both Cuba's role in the western hemisphere and the nature of revolutionary movements in Latin America. While we North Americans naturally enough focus on Cuba's—or more accurately, Fidel's—efforts to export his revolution, if we reflect we recognize that a very small part of Cuba's resources and energies are spent in that direction. Most of Fidel's time and almost all of most Cubans' time is devoted to domestic Cuban concerns, whether growing sugar cane or consolidating the revolution or enjoying baseball. Fidel, in other words, is not playing a role in Latin America even remotely comparable to that played by Ho Chi Minh, whatever Fidel's rhetorical pretensions may be. As for the revolutionary movements, we shall undoubtedly see more rather than less violence in Latin America during the decade ahead as numbers, growing numbers, of Latin American young people (including some of the region's most gifted and dedicated) despair of accomplishing necessary change peacefully and opt for the route of violent overthrow of institutions. We would err seriously if we were to regard their activity as being motivated by any widespread desire to subject their countries to the hegemony of Havana or Peking or Moscow. They may call themselves communists—not all of them will—but theirs is primarily a national and a social, not an

ideological, concern. Our usual reaction to such men, of course, is to fear and distrust them. And of course to the extent that we indiscriminately brand these men communists, we often play into the hands of Latin America's most reactionary elements.

Regrettably we are in some contexts obliged to work with such reactionary elements, for they are in control of their governments, and the Alliance for Progress—which is our institutional arrangement for promoting peaceful change, the "revolution in freedom" of which President Frei speaks—is to a very substantial degree a government-to-government operation. It is for this reason that some Latin Americans believe the Alliance was doomed from the outset—could anyone realistically expect, ask they, that the oligarchy would cooperate in its own planned destruction? But the problems of the Alliance as presently set up go beyond that, for the Alliance, designed in 1961 to provide from both public and private sources a total of \$2,000,000,000 a year of developmental assistance from the United States, is quite inadequate to make more than a scratch on the surface of Latin America. What we need to do—something that is very difficult for us to do as long as Vietnam and our domestic problems put such a heavy claim on our resources—is to think about ways through which vastly increased amounts can be made available to the Latin Americans for their developmental programs. From all external sources—external, that is, to Latin America—we should be thinking in terms of 20 billions rather than 2; and we are very far from that. If we were prepared during the next decade really to think about changing our trading posture vis-a-vis Latin America, giving them easier access to our markets, making Latin America truly a preferred area, we might get some distance toward the 20 billion annual goal.

I suspect, though, that the Alliance got off on the wrong foot and is disappointing to most of us because of an initial miscomprehension, namely, that development is primarily an economic matter, something that occurs when adequate financial and technical resources are made available. Actually, development, depending as it does upon appropriate values, attitudes, cultural sets, depending as it does upon the motivations of persons, of individuals, is much more a cultural and political phenomenon than it is economic one. Or to put it a bit differently, no amount of straightforward economic and financial assistance will achieve wholesome development in the absence of changes, marked changes, in the social and political dispensations.

During the next decade, therefore, I would urge us to rethink developmental priorities and to assign primacy to the political and cultural dimensions as against the narrowly economic ones. When we do begin to think in these ways, alternative courses of action appear to us; and also we discover that we do have resources here at home that, properly deployed, sensitively used, would vastly increase the amount of help we can give Latin America that, we hope, would speed Latin America's development. There is not time here to explore the possibilities, but I think of what could be done through more imaginative use of our voluntary associations, more imaginative use of our business resources, more imaginative and courageous use of our political organizations. There are problems and risks here, of course: problems of inadequate knowledge of the Latin American situation, problems of insensitivity on the part of many North Americans, risk derivative from the charge of "intervention"—for we are here getting close to some very sensitive areas. But let it be said that under the Alliance for Progress as presently set up, progress is not occurring, and the rich are getting richer while the poor are getting poorer. Unless we move strongly and creatively into

new areas, we are simply going to suffer one frustration after another.

Creativity here does oblige us to make some difficult distinctions and judgments. We are obliged to commit ourselves firmly and openly to the attainment of meaningfully participant democracy—something to which the Latin Americans themselves have been formally committed for a century and a half—and really to work, to bring our pressures to bear, to make that achievement possible. But at the same time we are obliged to recognize that political development is a highly complex process, one that requires the reconciliation of three only awkwardly compatible ingredients, public order, increased productivity, and popular involvement, or to put the matter alternatively, peace, progress, and participation. Doctrinaire opposition to military regimes is therefore as ill-advised as the doctrinaire assumption that Latin Americans are simply not capable of democratic development. My own view, however, is that participation is itself intrinsically valuable and achievement of meaningful participation ought to entitle those governments that attain—or are working conscientiously for its attainment—to a preferred status in our eyes and in the allocation of our resources. I think, though, that there is no society in this hemisphere—not Paraguay, not Haiti—in which the United States, in either its public or its private sector—could not find meaningful opportunities to promote political development; and I think that political development is the frontier area along which we should be moving most innovatively during the coming decade.

In summary, let me say two things: (1) Unless we and the Latin Americans really get to work on constructive development, with primary emphasis on political development, nothing much is going to happen in Latin America during the decade ahead. The region will not slide off toward totalitarianism—the communists and others lack that capability; but neither will the region move forward in directions and at a rate satisfactory to us and responsibly progressive Latin Americans. Rather, the area will continue to oscillate between spurts of ill-coordinated forward movement and sharp retrogressions, periods of reasonable tranquility interrupted by sporadic manifestations of violence. In short, we shall see the continuation of a slow descent toward social and political tragedy. (2) On the other hand, if we in the United States, using both increased public and vastly increased private resources and working in league with our forward-looking Latin American friends, really put our innovative capacity and our creative energy to work on the developmental challenge in Latin America, we may well surprise ourselves at the progress we can make. Latin America is difficult, no question about it. But no other area of the developing world offers more in the way of opportunity for constructive endeavor, offers more possibility to demonstrate that meaningful democracy is not an historical sport, to be enjoyed only briefly by a tiny, privileged minority of the earth's billions of persons. If we believe in democracy—as you and I do—let us get to work, then, systematically and soberly to make it relevant and operational for our brothers in Latin America.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, every day that goes by underscores the loss

suffered by all of us when Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated. I issued a statement expressing some of my sentiments and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON THE ASSASSINATION OF MARTIN LUTHER KING

The assassination of the apostle of non-violence is the greatest tragedy of its kind since the death of President Kennedy. It was no doubt the work of a diseased mind, but there is something fearfully wrong with a society that produces such diseased minds. All of us—whites and blacks alike—should rededicate ourselves to the goals toward which Dr. King was striving and for which he gave his life. What has happened—apparently at the hand of a white man—is a shame upon all whites. Let it be the signal for swift action to eradicate the evils Dr. King was struggling against. But let it not be a signal for a violent vengeance. Such vengeance, however understandable, would serve only to redouble the calamity and to make mockery of the sacrifice.

Milwaukee's WTMJ Opposes Municipal Industrial Financing

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, seldom have the people of Wisconsin been so united on an issue as they are on their opposition to the practice of municipal industrial financing.

For that reason, there was broad approval for the recent Treasury Department action ruling that the tax exemption on industrial development bonds would be abolished.

Subsequent Senate action overturning the Treasury action was received with considerable concern. That concern turned to approbation as the Senate reversed itself and adopted Senator Ribicoff's amendment which would end municipal financing by congressional consent.

Wisconsin residents are hopeful that the House-Senate conference on H.R. 15414, the pending tax bill, will decide one of two courses of action. Either the Ribicoff amendment should be accepted in its entirety or the entire matter should be dropped and the earlier Treasury Department ruling be allowed to stand.

We in Wisconsin have had enough of the "plant piracy" that has resulted from municipal industrial financing. We are tired of having our pockets picked in extra taxes to pay the way for tax-exempt bonds for building factories in other States. We are disgusted with the concept of "State socialism" which underlies the practice of industrial development bonding.

The sentiments of our Wisconsin people on this issue were stated very well recently in an editorial broadcast on radio and television by one of the Nation's most responsible and community-minded stations, WTMJ-TV of Milwaukee. I include the text of that editorial at this point and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

We voiced concern last week when the senate took a stand against a treasury department ruling to end tax exemptions on industrial development bonds. Subsequently, the senate reversed itself and legislated an end to the unfair tax loophole, effective next January 1st. Wisconsin is one of eight states that did not permit municipalities to issue tax free bonds to lure industries with the promise of cheap leases for their plants. Hopefully, such pirating of firms to locations having lower operating costs at the expense of federal taxpayers now will diminish. And investment money attracted to such bonds will instead flow to municipal issues in the public areas—such as schools, waterworks, sewers, public hospitals and roads.

States should continue to compete with each other for industries, but they should compete fairly. Wisconsin has been at a serious disadvantage, despite its attempt to hold industries by means of municipal assistance through industrial development corporations. These corporations are able to legally assemble land for industrial expansion purposes and also to aid in attracting financial assistance. These industrial corporations are widespread and, at last count, there were 280 in Wisconsin. They have been a big factor in keeping at least some smaller plants from moving out of the state. In a few instances parts of big companies were successfully held in Wisconsin. Most important are the jobs that are saved for our own residents and the new jobs that are created by help from the industrial development corporations.

Memorial at Lincoln's Tomb

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a memorial service for Rev. Martin Luther King was held April 7 at Lincoln's tomb in Springfield, Ill., attended by about 3,000 people. Rev. Negil McPherson, pastor of Zion Baptist Church, was in charge of the biracial, interfaith service. Invocation was by Msgr. John Bretz, pastor of Christ the King parish. Rev. Richard Paul Graebel, pastor of First Presbyterian Church, read excerpts from Reverend King's speeches. Rabbi Meyer Abramowitz of Temple B'rith Sholom, offered the memorial prayer. Vocal solos were by Mrs. Margie Jones, and Rev. Joseph Albrecht, pastor of the First Methodist Church, gave the benediction.

The stirring, inspirational, memorial sermon, by Rev. Rudolph S. Shultz, pastor of Union Baptist Church, included these statements:

Everywhere in our world, since last Thursday men of goodwill have been in great sorrow and we don't have to remind you why we are here.

As I sat at my desk to prepare this message, I remember a statement he made to me in 1960, when we were in Buffalo, N.Y. He said, "Shultz, non-violence is the only thing that we can do to express our grievances, so that the people of the United States can hear."

To many of us his death was a shock, but now that the shock is quieting down, one thing all of us can say, because he was here, he left the world richer.

We are grieved because of the death of this our "Modern Emancipator." He has given to those of us of color, new hopes when we were hopeless, new inspiration when we were lost, and down with despair, new ideals of

this country and new purpose of these United States, when we have lost hope in a country that says, "All men are created equal" and would not live up to that phrase.

Standing here at this spot, I think Springfield does have an ideal place for such an occasion, for here lies the body of a man, who was slain by a sniper's bullet, but, this did not stop the cause for which he gave his life, and let us serve warning that the cause for which Dr. Martin Luther King gave his life will not stop, for we have tasted the sweet wine of freedom, and we know that our voice should be heard. We are teaching our children the real meaning of, "One Nation under God." We have also come to realize the meaning of "The Land of Liberty," and this cause or ideals will not die. Of course the one who pulled the trigger on Thursday and those who may rejoice of his death, will never know how much these ideals have burned in our hearts and become a part of our lives.

Some have even said that Dr. King was sold out to the Communists because of his non-violence attitude toward the war in Viet Nam.

But, if you had ever had any dealings with that great leader, Our Modern Emancipator, you would have known that he was not for sale at any price, for he was already *Sold Out to A Master From Whom He Was Determined To Never Let Go*. Therefore, we know he was priceless.

To us he was like Abraham, he went where he was called and was faithful in all things, even unto death.

To us he was like Moses, he led us from doubts and fears to confidence, even in the face of many difficulties.

To us he was like Joshua, he gave us love for this country and was willing to fight and suffer for its success.

To us he was like Jonathan, he met many of us, discouraged, brother, and cheered us by giving us the strength.

To us he was like Isaiah, he constantly pointed to us, the brighter days and a better tomorrow.

Even in this last known public rally he said he may not enjoy it, but he knows it is coming.

Dr. King inspired us in 1963, with his dream that one day "My black children and my neighbors white children will walk hand in hand singing. Free at Last, Free at Last, Thank God, I am Free at Last."

He has inspired us with the meaning of the words of Christ, "Not only to go the mile that is asked of Thee,

but, go the other,

Not only to give your cloak, but your coat,

Not only take the slap on one cheek, but turn the other."

Because of the inspiration we received from him, we come to know and understand that freedom cannot be gained by riots, looting, burning or any other means, but through the process of non-violence.

Because of him we know and come to understand that the cause for which he lived, the principles and philosophy for which he gave his life will be our marching cry, until the unseen shackles of slavery will finally be removed, until we can say whether it is on the battlefields of Viet Nam, I am an American, not just a black American but, an American.

Another King Exhorts to Violence

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star today carried a UPI dispatch concerning the proposed poor people's campaign which will culminate

in a march in Washington, D.C., late in the month of May. The brother of the late Rev. Martin Luther King, the Reverend A. D. King was quoted as saying:

We are going to Washington and disrupt Washington so it cannot function unless it does something about the black folk.

Reverend King was also quoted as saying that if violence comes, it "will come only on the seed of white racism and this is not our fault."

This policy of disrupting Washington is, of course, the plan laid down by Martin Luther King before his violent death recently. Every concerned citizen was shocked at the vicious slaying of the civil rights leader, and everyone is anxious that his slayer, or slayers, is quickly apprehended and punished. But, in the interest of the maintenance of law and order, it must be remembered that any policy of civil disobedience is as former Supreme Court Justice Charles Whitaker puts it "active, overt, willful mass violations of our criminal laws."

In July 1967, the late Reverend King stated:

I can't recommend burning down Cleveland. We end up getting killed more than anyone else and our businesses get burned.

It would seem that Reverend King was not as much concerned with the moral aspect of burning a city as with the penalties accruing from the act.

At another time Reverend King reverted to the moral approach when he declared:

It may be necessary to engage in such acts. . . . Often an individual has to break a particular law in order to obey a higher law.

It is apparent that the proposal of policies of civil disobedience, as espoused by Martin Luther King are based on very unstable foundations.

Just as his brother proposes in his coming march, Martin Luther King sought to create dangerous situations while at the same time placing the blame for possible violence or disorder on others. In his book, "Why We Can't Wait," he stated:

The purpose of our direct-action program is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. . . . Actually, we who engage in non-violence direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with.

It is certainly high time that we recognize that, regardless of how many disclaimers of violence are made, the disruption of the orderly processes of city life are violations of criminal law. Justice Whitaker went right to the heart of the matter when he stated:

Active and overt acts willfully committed in violation of our criminal laws are criminal violations and not "civil disobedience."

Under unanimous consent I include the article, "Plan for March of Poor Listed," appearing in the Washington Star of April 22, 1968, in the RECORD, at this point:

PLAN FOR MARCH OF POOR LISTED—ABERNATHY HEDGES ON CAMP-IN SITES

ATLANTA.—A full timetable for marchers coming to Washington for the Poor Peoples' Campaign was announced yesterday by the successor to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

The Rev. Ralph Abernathy, who now heads the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, hedged again on announcing locations where campaigners would "camp-in" in tent and frame dwellings during the demonstration, which starts with an advance party of negotiators in Washington April 29.

A Washington coordinator, Anthony Henry, however said Saturday the campaigners would attempt to use the Mall for their "City of Hope," whether permission is granted or not. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall indicated last week permission would probably not be granted.

THREE-PRONGED MARCH

Abernathy will launch each phase of the three-pronged March to the Nation's Capital—from the South, the Midwest and the Northeast.

Planned by King to pressure the Johnson administration and Congress to take action to help the nation's poor, particularly in Negro ghettos and on tenant farms, the active campaign will begin May 2 at Memphis, Tenn., from the spot at the motel balcony where King was slain by a white sniper April 4. Abernathy will place a memorial plaque on the Lorraine Motel balcony.

King's brother, the Rev. A. D. King, told his congregation at Louisville, Ky., yesterday that "We are going to Washington and disrupt Washington so it cannot function unless it does something about the black folk." If violence comes, he said, it "will come only on the seed of white racism and this is not our fault."

Here is the timetable announced for the campaign:

April 29—Abernathy heads 100-man delegation of Negroes in talks with government officials to present their demands.

May 2—Abernathy lays memorial plaque in concrete of Lorraine Hotel balcony, leads march toward Marks, Miss.

May 4—March arrives in Marks to help local residents prepare mule-drawn wagon train which will wind its way through the South to Washington.

May 6—Second caravan leaves Jackson, Miss. in church buses for stops in Alabama to recruit more demonstrators.

May 7—Wagon train caravan, the main Southern contingent, begins trek to Washington via Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia.

May 8—Chicago Caravan leaves for Washington.

May 9—Boston caravan leaves for Washington.

May 12—First caravan reaches Washington.

May 13—Construction of shanty town begins in "prominent place" in Washington.

May 16—Chicago caravan arrives in Washington.

May 17—Boston caravan arrives in Washington.

May 18—Southern caravan reaches Washington.

May 21—Major demonstrations begin.

May 30—Mass march through downtown Washington with all caravans and "thousands" of local Negro residents.

Tet Offensive Disruption Held Exaggerated

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written con-

cerning the recent Communist Tet offensive. We have heard assertions that the offensive dealt a crippling blow to the rural pacification program and inflicted serious psychological damage on the South Vietnamese people. It is my opinion that these assertions are inaccurate and do not reflect the true picture of the effect of the Communist offensive.

An excellent estimate of the results of the Tet offensive appeared in an editorial in the April 16 Evening Star, based on the report of a prominent Vietnamese physician, Dr. Phan Quang Dan. This estimate presents the view that the reports of disruption of the pacification program are greatly exaggerated, and rejects the notion of a great Communist victory. I agree with this appraisal and feel that it is further evidence of the military superiority which has been established in South Vietnam and the lack of public support for the Communist movement.

Under unanimous consent I insert this editorial in the RECORD so that you may have an opportunity to read it:

TET OFFENSIVE DISRUPTION HELD EXAGGERATED
(By Crosby S. Noyes)

At the risk of seeming to flog a dead horse, a new estimate of the results of the Communist Tet offensive in Vietnam is worth considering.

The estimate is new, at least, to the American public. Written last month by a prominent Vietnamese physician, Dr. Phan Quang Dan, it was turned over to American Embassy officials in Saigon and recently made available here.

The report is significant because the horse is actually far from dead. The argument over what really happened in the course of the Communist offensive launched during the lunar new year holidays at the end of January still goes on. Public opinion about current developments in Vietnam and Washington is strongly conditioned by it.

Official claims that the Tet offensive amounted to a major defeat for the Communists have been met with widespread hoots of derision in this country and abroad. Heavy as the losses of the Communists were, it has been argued that they were more than offset by the psychological damage inflicted on South Vietnam and in the United States.

The idea has persisted that the American position in Vietnam and that of the government in Saigon were gravely weakened by the attacks on the cities. Hanoi, quite predictably, seized on this theme as the explanation for Lyndon Johnson's bid for peace talks and his withdrawal from the presidential race. And so, it seems, have many others.

In particular, it is said, the Tet offensive showed the futility of all the efforts that have been made in the area of rural pacification in Vietnam. With the withdrawal of pacification teams from many villages to the larger cities, it has been widely assumed, even by American officials, that the Communists quickly moved in and took over.

In fact, according to this detailed report, nothing of the sort happened. The Communist effort was directed entirely against the 36 provincial capitals, all of which were attacked and many seized at least for a few days. Though the smaller towns and villages were left pretty much to defend themselves, the assumption that many of them were taken over by the Communists now appears to be disproved. Says Dr. Dan:

"No district capital was attacked. The countryside was quiet. And during the first week of the Communist assault, highways were usually free throughout South Vietnam."

"The Communist general offensive amounted to a flurry of simultaneous raids on provincial cities. The districts and vil-

lages were left unruffled, sketching out the limits of Communist strength and capabilities."

A revised American assessment is only slightly less optimistic about the over-all picture. The latest figures show that out of 9,024 hamlets rated as contested or relatively secure, only 355 fell temporarily under Viet Cong control. Those affected by Communist efforts in the countryside amounted to something less than 8 percent of the total rural population.

If this is an accurate picture of what happened—and there is reason to believe that it is—the reports of wholesale disruption of the pacification program have been greatly exaggerated. And so also, in Dr. Dan's opinion, have been the estimates of psychological damage.

In contrast to public reaction to earlier major upheavals such as the Japanese coup against the French in Vietnam in 1945, the signing of the Geneva agreement in 1954 or the overthrow of Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963, the people this time remained remarkably calm. Despite fervent appeals, very few rallied to the support of the Communists. No one questioned the authority of the elected government in Saigon and the South Vietnamese army in most places responded vigorously to the attack.

Dr. Dan, who is by no means incurably optimistic or uncritical of the Saigon regime, firmly rejects the notion of a great Communist victory. In his view: "South Vietnam, with all its weaknesses, is emerging from the lunar new year storm as a definitely viable state with a basically loyal army and police and a population firmly committed to freedom."

This is admittedly the judgment of one man who is deeply engaged in the struggle against communism in Vietnam and deeply concerned by the defeatism in this country. But it may serve to stimulate second thoughts among those who believe there is nothing left to do except throw in the sponge.

Earl Radke, a Great American

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the record of service to the needy of Mr. Earl L. Radke, one of our Nation's most outstanding veterans and a man whom we of the San Fernando Valley are proud to have as our neighbor.

Earl Radke was born in Chicago, Ill., August 18, 1894. In 1917 he was married and he entered the Army infantry. He later left the infantry with an honorable discharge.

In 1926, the Radkes moved west to California into the town of Reseda—now part of the 22d District of California, which I represent. He was one month slow from becoming a charter member of Reseda Post 308 of the American Legion, but he has been a member of good standing of that post since 1928.

As Earl was active in the American Legion so was his wife in the American Legion Auxiliary, where she was instrumental in taking the Spanish American and World War I veterans from Wadsworth Veterans' Administration hospital on picnic lunches out to the beach areas of Santa Monica—an all-day trip. Mrs. Radke passed away in October of 1958.

Earl, now alone, has continued to give this extra service to hospital patients. He has been service officer of his post for the past 6 years. Twice he has been an area chaplain, servicing over 20,000 Legionnaires; and chaplain of the 20th District which serves over 8,000 members. So many times has he served in this capacity that recently he was named chaplain emeritus, a title in which he takes justifiable pride.

In 1967 Earl called at various hospitals over 130 times. He made 45 home visits and attended 25 funerals. He also attended 11 hospital programs and received more than 150 phone calls from people seeking his counsel on such matters as widows' benefits, funeral arrangements, GI benefits for surviving children, aid for disabled veterans, how and where to get a job and hundreds of related points.

Earl has driven more than 4,500 miles to accomplish these tasks. It costs him between \$500 and \$600 a year for his hospital visits alone—but Earl Radke has never asked for a dime.

No amount of money, however, could be sufficient to pay men such as Earl Radke who devote so much of their time, who give so much of themselves to the service of mankind.

Launching of SS "Alaskan Mail"

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1968, while the House was in recess the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., in my district, launched another vessel which will make a notable contribution to the role of our merchant marine, the SS *Alaskan Mail* of the American Mail Line. The sponsor of this new ship was the gracious wife of the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT.

Senator BARTLETT, the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, delivered a most stirring address immediately preceding the christening. I include it in the RECORD so that all might share the import of its message:

LAUNCHING OF SS "ALASKAN MAIL"

There is something about a launching that stirs the spirit.

Perhaps it is the excitement of being in on the start of something new; perhaps a feeling of pride in seeing a new American ship slide down the ways; perhaps just simply a feeling of awe at what man can build if he but concentrates on construction rather than on destruction.

In recent days, the news has been more of the latter than the former. Events conspire to test our capacity to make our way in a modern world with compassion, fairness and wisdom. Pressures build to push us along paths which lead to disaster.

At home, some persons would use the acts of a few as an excuse to punish the many.

In foreign affairs, some persons, seeing the world only from our sides of the oceans, promote policies benefitting narrow, short-range interests at the expense of the general good.

In these trying times, a ship launching

takes on heightened meaning. A launching is the start of something new, and a sign of faith in the future of a nation crying out for such signs.

The launching of a modern vessel does create pride, for in a nation less sure than it was of its ability to compete freely in the modern world, the launching is a sign of a will to challenge the seas and the men of other lands who sail them.

A new ship is an awe-inspiring example of the technical skill of a nation, and as such, a sign to other nations that we are far from being ready to lower the U.S. flag on the trade routes of the world's oceans.

Clearly, in launching the *Alaskan Mail*, the American Mail Line is setting an example not only for other steamship companies, but for all those persons who believe that it is both good economics and good for international relations to increase rather than decrease our business dealings with foreign nations.

The American Mail Line is no inexperienced, new arrival in the shipping business. To the contrary, it can trace its origin to 1850, making it one of the oldest steamship lines in America. When such an experienced firm undertakes a vessel replacement program involving construction of five of the largest dry cargo liners in the world, including the *Alaskan Mail*, there is good reason to believe that if international trade is permitted to flourish we can and will have a modern merchant fleet, a fleet that will be able to carry American goods to foreign ports and foreign goods to American ports, ensuring that no foreign power will be able to interfere with our ability to trade.

Obviously, Worth B. Fowler, president of the American Mail Line, and the other officers of the company who decided to undertake a major building program at a time when an air of uncertainty hangs over the future of this country's merchant marine industry, believe that foreign trade will flourish in the years ahead.

I would like to be as confident as they must be, but there are disturbing signs that foreign trade will not grow as it should because inhibiting restraints may be applied.

You may recall that a few moments ago I spoke of pressures building to push us along dangerous paths, both at home and abroad. While this may not be the proper place to discuss the problems of our cities and Vietnam, I do think it is both proper and important to discuss briefly the growing pressure on Congress to enact various barriers to free trade, for many persons here have an important stake in foreign trade.

Already the Senate has approved restrictions on the importation of textile articles. Countless of other bills setting similar restrictions on a wide range of imports have been introduced in the Senate. If passage of the textile import bill has not already broken the log jam of such bills, the passage of one or two more will surely start a torrent of such bills, running from mink to zinc.

I do not mean to minimize the problems of industries facing competition from foreign imports. However, I do believe, and believe quite strongly, that the erection of trade barriers is not the way to alleviate these problems.

Let us take a brief look at what might happen if Congress did enact such legislation.

It is virtually certain that foreign governments would retaliate by erecting additional trade barriers of their own. If that were to happen, our balance-of-trade surplus would be greatly reduced if not eliminated entirely. And it is important to realize that the effects of cutbacks in trade would not be restricted to those industries which had received tariff protection. Rather, the effect would snowball across the entire foreign trade picture. As William M. Roth, U.S. special representative for trade negotiations, told a group of Detroit businessmen last fall,

"If the United States shuts out imports of European textiles, or glass, or steel, don't assume that it will be the American textile or glass or steel exporters who necessarily pay. It may be you—or one of your best customers."

The truth of that statement is indicated by the consideration the Common Market has given to curbing imports on such U.S. products as tobacco and feed grains, or by the threat that Japan will retaliate with massive new trade barriers if this country imposes textile quotas.

I have a special interest in trade with Japan. Because of its location, and because of its many natural resources, Alaska can supply many of the raw materials Japan needs to maintain its impressive industrial growth. In 1966, Alaska enjoyed a balance of foreign trade surplus of almost \$60 million, a surplus important to the economy of the nation as well as the state.

I would think that the American Mail Line and other shipping firms operating to the Far East and the shipbuilding firms which construct the vessels for these lines share my interest in seeing that trade with Asia flourishes rather than diminishes.

Because of my interest in free trade, I have opposed travel as well as trade restrictions. An effort is being made to convince Japan, for example, to relax certain restrictions which hamper the ability of Americans to do business in Japan. It made no sense to me to seek such concessions from Japan while at the same time we attempt to discourage the travel of U.S. citizens in Japan, particularly in light of my belief that if we win these concessions, we will accomplish a lot more for our balance of trade problem than we could through travel restrictions.

But perhaps the most insidious aspect of trade barriers is the effect they would have even if other nations did not retaliate.

At this moment in history, we are the world's leading international merchant, a fact that keeps our balance of payments situation from getting completely out of hand. If we erect trade barriers, then nations which sell products here will have fewer American dollars to buy American exports. Therefore, our export market would suffer even without foreign retaliation in the form of trade barriers.

Then, of course, a cutback in certain foreign imports would mean the loss of jobs in this nation. In addition, such a cutback would no doubt result in an increase in the price of many items, thereby adding pressure to our economy's inflationary spiral. And finally, it could well relax the efforts of some firms to modernize their operation in order to compete with foreign imports. I happen to believe that this nation possesses the technical skill to find ways to compete with foreign firms, and inasmuch as trade barriers are nothing more than a form of subsidized protection for certain industries, I much prefer that we help such industries through subsidies for job-retraining, technical assistance and other similar programs.

The Wall Street Journal, on October 5, 1967, put the case against trade barriers most succinctly when it stated:

"Trade restrictions, in sum, provide benefits for U.S. firms in the domestic market, though these gains may be only temporary. On the other hand, import curbs endanger the nation's exports, impose penalties on consumers and tend to weaken the vigor of the country's economy. Looked at from all sides, the package hardly seems appealing."

My purpose in speaking on this subject on this occasion is more than to merely warn you of the growing support for protectionist legislation. Rather, my purpose is to enlist you, meaning the entire maritime industry, in the effort to head off such legislation.

As chairman of the Senate Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, I am well aware that the maritime industry divided can mount a most effective lobbying effort. I stand in awe of what you can do united.

It seems to me that the men who build the ships to sail the seas of the world, and the men who buy and operate those ships should be united in the effort to see that world trade continues to grow, for ships will be built only if there is commerce to be carried. Certainly the American Mail Line and the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Company will profit.

Problems we have, but problems we have always had, and problems have never deterred us from moving ahead.

This launching is an example of moving ahead in the face of problems. It is not secret that many persons believe our days are numbered as a great maritime nation, that we cannot cure the sickness that decays our merchant fleet, that we cannot compete with foreign maritime nations.

Well, to those who feel that way, I say come to the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company and see what we can build. Come to Newport News and inspect the *Alaskan Mail*, a modern ship built to compete in a modern world. Come to Newport News to see the launching of four more such liners, and then tell me we are through as a great maritime nation. We are not if we but have the will to rebuild our fleet and I salute Mr. Fowler and Donald A. Holden, president and chairman of the board of directors of the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company, and all who work with them, from highest to lowest, for showing the way.

Yes, problems we have, but problems we have always had. Let us attack the problems of today with the same confidence and ingenuity we attacked our problems of the past.

Let us not bow to pressures calling for short-lived solutions.

Let us band together to create pressures for meaningful and fair solutions to these problems.

Let the spirit stirred by this launching be translated into action.

Secretaries Week

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in what has become one of the most widely noted annual events, Secretaries Week is being observed for the 17th consecutive year from April 21 through 27, 1968, with Wednesday, April 24, highlighted as Secretaries Day. This event is sponsored by The National Secretaries Association, International, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce.

While NSA is first and foremost a professional association devoted to raising the performance standards of the secretarial profession, NSA members spent 103,996 volunteer-after-job hours on local community projects. This is equivalent to 2,599 40-hour weeks or 52 work years.

Beneficiaries of this volunteer secretarial work were, for the most part, health and medical, social welfare, and civic organizations. The two most frequently designated were hospitals, 14,788 hours, and Easter Seal Society, 8,773. Others most recurrently listed were: American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, American Red Cross, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, Community Chests and Councils of America, Girls' Clubs of America, March

of Dimes, National Association for Mental Health, National Tuberculosis Association, Service to the Blind, YMCA, YWCA, and chambers of commerce.

This is a remarkable expression by skilled and conscientious secretaries of responsible citizenship at the grassroots level.

Gallup Poll: Nixon Leads

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit the leading article of the Pittsburgh Press for April 21, 1968, on the present ratings by the Gallup poll, of the leading candidates for President. Under this latest national poll Dick Nixon shows surprising strength and backing by the American people.

The article follows:

THE GALLUP POLL: NIXON LEADS THREE TOP DEMOCRATS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Richard Nixon leads each of the three top Democratic presidential hopefuls—Sen. Robert Kennedy, Vice President Hubert Humphrey and Sen. Eugene McCarthy—in nationwide "test elections" just completed.

Of the three Democrats, Sens. McCarthy and Kennedy make the best showing, falling just 3 percentage points behind Mr. Nixon.

Ex-Gov. George Wallace of Alabama, the candidate of the American Independent Party, runs behind the major-party candidates, winning the support of approximately one-tenth of the nation's votes.

Test Election Races

[In percent]

Nixon	41
McCarthy	38
Wallace	10
Undecided	11
Nixon	41
Kennedy	38
Wallace	10
Undecided	11
Nixon	43
Humphrey	34
Wallace	9
Undecided	14

Between April 6 and 11, a representative national sample of 1168 registered voters asked the following questions:

"Suppose the presidential election were being held today. If Richard Nixon were the Republican candidate, and Robert Kennedy (Hubert Humphrey/Eugene McCarthy) were the Democratic candidate and George Wallace of Alabama were the candidate of a third party, which one would you like to see win?"

In interpreting the results, it is important to keep in mind that the personal interviews for this survey were obtained at a point in time when a series of events had just occurred which had forceful impact: President Johnson's withdrawal from this year's presidential race, his announcement of a relaxation in the bombing of North Vietnam, the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and the beginning of the urban rioting which resulted.

Despite the fact that Sen. McCarthy runs as strong as Sen. Kennedy against Mr. Nixon, the Minnesota senator is the third choice of Democratic voters nationally to receive the party's nomination.

As reported earlier, among rank-and-file Democrats, nomination preferences are: Sen.

Kennedy, 35 per cent; Mr. Humphrey, 31 per cent; and, Sen. McCarthy, 23 per cent.

Sen. McCarthy's strength in test elections is due to his appeal to voters outside his own party. Among independents, for example, the McCarthy-Nixon race is extremely close. Mr. Nixon, however, overpowers both Sen. Kennedy and Mr. Humphrey in this important voting group.

The results of the three test election races by party affiliation follows:

NIXON—McCARTHY—WALLACE

[In percent]

	Republican	Democrat	Independent
Nixon.....	80	18	38
McCarthy.....	11	56	36
Wallace.....	2	12	15
Undecided.....	7	14	11

NIXON—KENNEDY—WALLACE

Nixon.....	78	16	43
Kennedy.....	12	61	30
Wallace.....	3	11	16
Undecided.....	7	12	11

NIXON—HUMPHREY—WALLACE

Nixon.....	85	15	44
Humphrey.....	6	59	25
Wallace.....	2	9	16
Undecided.....	7	17	15

Speak to Ho, Mr. Kosygin

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include an editorial from the Florida Times-Union of April 19, 1968, relating to the present dilemma in our peace negotiations with the North Vietnamese. I think this very fine editorial points to the fallacy of the North Vietnamese argument in which they have refused all of the sites offered by the United States for negotiations. I offer it for the benefit of my colleagues:

SPEAK TO HO, MR. KOSYGIN

Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin was talking to the wrong country when he urged the United States to stop the bombing of North Vietnam and to "start negotiations immediately" for peace.

Kosygin's admonition was another of the artful Communist declarations which contain insinuations and word plays that always manage to place the Reds in a good light and their foes in the dark.

It is not the United States which is refusing to meet on neutral ground to negotiate openly for peace. It is North Vietnam. The North Vietnamese have turned down every U.S. recommendation because they want to "save face."

Likewise it must be noted that the North Vietnamese have not agreed to talk "peace." Only President Johnson, speaking as the leader of the United States, has offered to negotiate for "peace" in Vietnam. The regime of Ho Chi Minh seeks only negotiations to end the bombing of North Vietnam.

Obviously, the North Vietnamese government would like to stop the bombing because of the strain the attacks are placing on its efforts to keep Red units in the south fully manned and supplied. The growing failure of the Red supply effort is being understood now in many areas and can help

explain the devastating defeat of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the Tet offensive and the siege of Khe Sanh.

Red artillery and rocket attacks in the south have decreased in ferocity during recent months. The shelling at Khe Sanh diminished daily in what could be said was a ratio to the aerial bombardment being sustained by the Reds. Red manpower in the area also was seriously reduced.

If Premier Kosygin wants the peace talks to get under way, he had better talk like a Dutch uncle to the North Vietnamese. He has a right to do so, as his country is spending an estimated \$18 billion a year in the fight.

Kosygin should tell the North Vietnamese to quit trying to accomplish at the negotiating table what they cannot accomplish in the battle area, namely to halt air attacks that are interdicting their supply routes and playing havoc with their ground forces.

As long as the Reds believe they can bring about a total and unconditional cessation of the bombing thus leaving their supply lines free to beef up Communist forces in South Vietnam, they will not willingly go to the bargaining table to talk about true peace in Southeast Asia.

Of Racial Strife

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Robert Wilson, of Carmichael, Calif., several months ago, wrote a poem about Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which was to be one of a book of poems he is authoring.

With the untimely death of Dr. King, he has submitted the poem to me with the following message:

I ask nothing from it but that it may in some small measure help bring reason and understanding to this country.

I am today sharing his poem with my colleagues:

OF RACIAL STRIFE

(By Robert Wilson)

In the heat of my life I have prayed. I have prayed to the Lord for him to intercede. I have said unto him:

"Impede, Dear Lord, the hands of time
Till in some future land I climb
Where pigment is but fashion's face
And man for love has vanquished race.
What now for me but suffer more
And bear the cross my father bore?"

For I have understood my historic circumstance and I have asked my God to conceive:

"Conceive, Dear God, my shallow sea,
A race without its history.
No ancient gods nor timeless men
To give the child who bears my skin.
Just slavery and social caste,
The institutions from my past."

I have had a prayer and I have had a dream. I have dreamed of a simple justice for I have had a thought:

"A thought, Dear Lord, a just embrace
To press man's soul into his face
And let him see of inner man
Until he wills to understand
That thought alone is fashioned free,
The inner of society."

But, alas, my brethren, I have known my only alternative, and your only alternative, our only course and the only course for all of mankind:

"Alas, Dear God, the why of life—
To dignity of racial strife.
A mission clear to teach mankind
That tyranny inverts the mind
And breeds the guilt which seals its fate
To suffer death in seas of hate."

Dissent, 1968 Style

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Solicitor General of the United States and former dean of the Harvard Law School, Erwin N. Griswold spoke for many of us in the Congress and in the Nation when he delivered his thought-provoking address, "Dissent, 1968 Style" at the Tulane University School of Law on April 16, 1968.

Dean Griswold's thesis was that a citizen has a moral right to engage in civil disobedience only after the most objective and searching inquiry into his own motives to make certain that the goals he seeks cannot be achieved by addressing his cause to the law or the national conscience. Further, he states that those who engage in civil disobedience must be prepared to pay the consequences. While admitting that circumstances may morally justify such a course of action, Dean Griswold rejects the contention that anyone promoting any cause has a legal justification for civil disobedience. He recognizes that many marches and demonstrations—which are intended to be peaceful in fact become violent civil disorders and sometimes even riots.

I call your attention especially to several excerpts from the address which certainly reflect my own personal viewpoint:

Our society has become increasingly tolerant of the mischievous attempts to excuse deliberate violations of the law committed in furtherance of what the actor personally regards as a lofty cause.

... I suggest that (the) intellectual and practical consequences of indiscriminate civil disobedience is the 'Legitimation of violence' of which we have seen too much of in America.

A climate that tends towards the approval and encouragement of violence as a form of protest has been created by white terrorism directed against nonviolent protest, including instances of murder of some civil rights workers, by the open defiance of law and federal authority by state and local officials resisting desegregation, and by protest groups engaging in civil disobedience who turn their backs on non-violence, go beyond constitutionally protected rights of petition and free assembly, and resort to violence to attempt to compel alteration of laws and policies with which they disagree.

Our law and custom have long been clear that the right to differ with society and to reject its code of behavior has limits, and the First Amendment will not do service to sanction every sort of activity that is sought to be justified as an expression of nonconformity.

Today much protest seems reflexive rather than cerebral, motivated more by the desire to reject established positions and policies than by deliberate preference for some alternative. Perhaps I am not perceptive enough to discern the latent wisdom and goals of the movements that seek the elevation of dirty

words on campus, or that exalt the virtues of "flower power", or that conduct a "strip in" in a public park. The message, if there is one, escapes me.

I doubt that personal ridicule or broad gauge contumely has ever produced light rather than heat.

The fact that one is a dissenter with a right to express his opposition entitles him to no special license . . . no roving commission to ignore the rules and underlying assumption of society.

The mere fact that a person wishes to make a public point does not sanction any method he chooses to use to make it . . . Such an argument has as its major unarticulated premise the assumption that people who want to propagandize protests or views have a constitutional right to do so whenever and however and wherever they please. That notion the (Supreme) Court vigorously and forthrightly rejected.

The text of Dean Griswold's statement follows:

DISSENT, 1968 STYLE

(The George Abel Dreyfous Lecture on Civil Liberties, given at the Tulane University School of Law, New Orleans, La., on Tuesday, April 16, 1968, Central Standard Time by Erwin N. Griswold, Solicitor General of the United States.)

"Preserving civil peace is the first responsibility of government."¹

"Unfortunately, since the populace has been sluggish and complacent, occasional violence seems to be advantageous to wake people up . . ."²

When I first accepted the invitation to deliver this year's Dreyfous Lecture, it was my intention to discuss, in a rather abstract way, some of the changes that have taken place in the modes of dissent over the years. The sad events of the past ten days, however, have led me to revise my emphasis somewhat. Rather than recite the changes of the past, I wish to speak to you tonight about some fundamental postulates of our democratic society, principles which I believe must be kept in vivid focus and which must be meaningfully communicated to the community as a whole if true freedom—not frenetic license—is to endure.

Let me begin by confessing that I am aware that between the polar extremes which I shall discuss there are confusing overlays of principle and policy and there will remain very substantial areas where the conscientious judgment of the informed individual is the only operative standard. But for the individual to make a rational choice, he must be aware of the values and consequences at stake when he forms his conscience and determines to follow it, and it is in the hope that it will encourage reflective appreciation of what is truly involved in "civil disobedience"—which has become the most pervasive contemporary aspect of civil liberties—that I submit these remarks for your attention.

I

Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz touched on the core of the problem in his address last month before a conference organized by the American Assembly and the American Bar Association when he suggested that in recent years there has been a material change in the public attitude toward law. He observed that law is now too often viewed "not as the living model for a free society, but rather as a mode of callous repression, or—no less disturbingly—as a collection of precatory suggestions which can be flouted or ignored."³

¹ Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders 171 (March 1, 1968).

² Goodman, "The Resisters Support U.S. Traditions and Interests," in *On Civil Disobedience*, 1967, N.Y. Times Magazine, November 26, 1967, p. 124.

³ "Some Reflections on the Challenges to Lawyers and the Law," March 16, 1968.

The focus of these remarks, just as with the Ambassador's observation, is not professional crime engaged in by those who are indifferent to legal obstacles to their own enrichment. What is of more concern is that our society has become increasingly tolerant of the mischievous attempts to excuse deliberate violations of the law committed in furtherance of what the actor personally regards as a lofty cause. I shall advert later on to justifiable examples of civil disobedience, but what I suggest is that intellectual and practical consequence of indiscriminate civil disobedience is the "Legitimation of violence" of which we have seen too much in America. I borrow this phrase from the recent Presidential Riot Commission, which listed this sorry fact of American society as one of the basic causes of riots. The Commission's conclusion, under this heading is as follows:

"A climate that tends toward the approval and encouragement of violence as a form of protest has been created by white terrorism directed against nonviolent protest, including instances of abuse and even murder of some civil rights workers in the South, by the open defiance of law and Federal authority by state and local officials resisting desegregation, and by some protest groups engaging in civil disobedience who turn their backs on nonviolence, go beyond constitutionally protected rights of petition and free assembly and resort to violence to attempt to compel alteration of laws and policies with which they disagree. This condition has been reinforced by a general erosion of respect for authority in American society and the reduced effectiveness of social standards and community restraints on violence and crime."

The ink is not yet dry on the latest confirmation of this conclusion. The almost inevitable retaliation that the Commission spoke of was not long in coming, and over a hundred cities have been wracked by the manifestation of grim, mindless destruction. To argue that massive retaliation against society at large is both unjustifiable and self-defeating⁴—while unquestionably correct—misses the point that our national temperament has become too much acclimated to violence as a method of social protest.

Perhaps you may interject that no one who champions the right of protest in general, or the privilege of civil disobedience in particular, would seek to justify either political assassinations or riots. Of course I would not dispute this caveat, but the troubling circumstances I have sketched have both a logical and a practical relevance to issues of protest and dissent. They are logically related to our focus because they represent the ultimate mode of dissent—rejection not merely of the position of the majority but of the very foundation of civilized society itself: Civil Order. They have a practical impact on our topic too, for these extreme acts I have adverted to are in a sense the product of the same indiscriminating and uncritical attitude toward individual choice about the binding nature of law that underlies less dramatic but similarly irresponsible forms of protest.

II

We Americans have always taken a considerable measure of pride in our personal independence and right to nonconformity. But in my view, effective self-government is nevertheless the greatest achievement of mankind. I trust that most Americans share the conclusion that Government is not merely inevitable but highly desirable. And from this axiom, certain corollaries flow.

The first of these is, I think that civil disobedience differs quite radically in impor-

tant respects from ordinary modes of protest and dissent. The crucial attribute of civil disobedience is that it is expressed through deliberate violation of the law.⁵ Read in the context of its origin, the First Amendment not only creates a right to dissent but in a very real sense encourages the exercise of this prerogative. That is why we are concerned about "chilling" First Amendment freedoms. But our law and custom have long been clear that the right to differ with society and to reject its code of behavior has limits, and the First Amendment will not do service to sanction every sort of activity that is sought to be justified as an expression of non-conformity.

Second, equally important and sometimes profoundly troubling, our political tradition has long recognized that a man's abiding duty to his conscience transcends his obligation to the State. Chief Justice Hughes once put it this way:

"Much has been said of the paramount duty to the State, a duty to be recognized, it is urged, even though it conflicts with convictions of duty to God. Undoubtedly that duty to the State exists within the domain of power, for government may enforce obedience to laws regardless of scruples. When one's belief collides with the power of the State, the latter is Supreme within its sphere and submission or punishment follows. But, in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the State has always been maintained."

Third, in a democracy such as ours, each individual shares both a political and a moral duty "actively to participate—to some degree, at least—in the processes of government and law-making." I am quoting the words of my friend, Professor J. N. D. Anderson of the University of London.⁶ He continues: "In a democracy, indeed, every citizen bears a measure of personal responsibility for misgovernment, bad laws, or wrong policies, unless he has played his full part in trying to get a better government into power, better laws on the statute book, and better policies adopted."

As my fourth corollary, and here perhaps I will meet with slightly less universal agreement, I suggest that what we have been classically concerned about protecting is the dissemination of ideas—protecting the individual's access to the intellectual marketplace where he may offer his conception of the ills and remedies for social or political problems. Thus, historically, our motivation and our objective have been the attempt to encourage the search for truth or wisdom, or both. To quote Chief Justice Hughes again:

"The maintenance of the opportunity for free political discussion to the end that government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes may be obtained by lawful means, an opportunity essential to the security of the Republic, is a fundamental principle of our constitutional system."

Given these principles, which I regard as not merely orthodox but sound, let me turn to the forms of dissent and protest which are currently the vogue so that we may proceed to consider some of the problems of dissent and in particular of civil disobedience.

III

Toward the end of the last century, Justice Holmes observed that on the basis of his experience, "Behind every scheme to make the

⁴ One of the more thoughtful analysis of this topic is that given by Dean Francis Allen in *Civil Disobedience and the Legal Order*, 36 U. Cin. L. Rev. 1, 175 (1967).

⁵ *United States v. Macintosh*, 283 U.S. 605, 633 (Hughes, C. J., and Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone, JJ., dissenting).

⁶ Anderson, *Into the World—the Need and Limits of Christian Involvement* 41 (London 1968).

⁷ *Stromberg v. California*, 283 U.S. 359, 369.

world over, lies the question, What kind of world do you want?"¹⁰ It may well have been true in those times that dissent and protest and agitation—for women's suffrage, or prohibition, or socialism, or anarchism, or whatever—had a more or less conscious and systematic design for the objective which was sought to be achieved. But today, much protest seems reflexive rather than cerebral, motivated more by the desire to reject established positions and policies than by deliberate preference for some alternatives. Perhaps I am not perceptive enough to discern the latent wisdom and goals of movements that seek the elevation of dirty words on campus, or that exalt the virtues of "flower power", or that conduct a "strip in" in a public park. The message, if there is one, escapes me.

We have in this country, of course, recognized that the display of symbols as an expression of some dissenting position is entitled to constitutional protection. That was settled as long ago at least as the "red flag" case.¹¹ But all this presupposes that there is some intelligible and definable nexus between the form of the protest and what is being protested. Thus, when a prominent New York couple several years ago decided to express their indignation at increased municipal taxes by stringing clotheslines draped with rags and tattered uniforms in their front yard, the state courts found this "bizarre" manner of symbolic dissent unprotected, with Judge Stanley Fuld writing that it was clear that the "value of their 'protest' lay not in its message but in its offensiveness."¹² And the Supreme Court summarily ruled that their claims of "free speech" were in the circumstances clearly frivolous.

I have similar difficulty with other popular forms of modern "dissent". Have we reached the point in this country where anything is contributed to our shared desire for progress and achievement by "writing dirty words on a fence about the President of the country? Or calling members of his Administration names?"¹³ No less prominent a spokesman for dissent than Bayard Rustin has expressed his "puzzlement" at the tactics employed by some young people in proclaiming their disenchantment with present conditions. He remarks rather pointedly that he is "concerned about their believing that you can educate people on the basis of simplistic slogans . . . rather than on the basis of a concrete program of concrete recommendations."¹⁴ While satire and sharp rapier-thrusts have long been among the accepted, and effective, modes of social and political criticism, I doubt that personal ridicule or broad-gauge contumely has ever produced light rather than heat, or constructively contributed to the resolution of major questions.

I do not question the constitutional right to be irrelevant or intemperate or even unfair. Our jurisprudence has made it clear that it is a prerogative of American citizenship "to criticize public men and measures—and that means not only informed and responsible criticism but the freedom to speak foolishly and without moderation."¹⁵ In part this is the consequence of the assumption of our democratic system that the people can be trusted to test competing ideas and pro-

posals, after free discussion, and "to withstand ideas that are wrong."¹⁶ And in part it reflects our policy that even damaging and false assertions, and those unrelated to alternative programs, must be suffered lest the submission of important and constructive suggestions be deterred.¹⁷

iv

There is a contemporary aspect of the problem to which, I think, too little attention has been given.

When our basic notions of freedom of speech, and of the right to dissent, were developed—largely in the eighteenth century—communication was very different from what it is now. There were fewer people—only three million in the United States. Most of them were close to the soil, and many were not unduly literate. The market place for political ideas was more limited than it is now.

Perhaps of even greater importance, though, was the fact that the speed of communication of ideas was very slow. Freedom of speech and press meant freedom for Thomas Paine to publish "Common Sense," or for John Adams to write an article for a newspaper and for the newspaper to publish it. When these and other things were printed, they were read in the privacy of the home, with few other persons around. Ideas had an opportunity to percolate, to be examined and considered, and to be refined and reformed in the thoughts of the people.

Of course, there was speech making, too. But one person's voice could reach perhaps a thousand people, perhaps somewhat more under very special circumstances. The speech, could, of course, be printed, but it would be the next day before it was read in the same community, and days or weeks before it was read elsewhere. Almost always, there was time for thoughtful consideration. Moreover, the volume of material which was communicated, in print or by speech, was very limited. There was adequate opportunity for thoughtful people to comprehend, to absorb, and digest. In the modern world, though, this has been changed completely. The change has been developing over the years, with the telegraph and telephone, and the speed of transportation. With the coming of the radio, it was possible for President Roosevelt to address fifty or one hundred million people at once, with an impact that had never been known before.

In recent years, the facilities of communication have continued to develop until our situation is utterly different from what it was even a generation ago. In older days, a person who had an idea to express—whether of dissent, or otherwise, had some difficulty in bringing this about. To publish it in a book or pamphlet might be beyond his means. There were few newspapers, and these did not have much space. Unless the idea was extremely good, or well expressed, it was not likely that a newspaper could be found to publish it.

Today, however, the news media are avid for news. Television stations are putting out news through all the hours of the day, and they are always seeking something new or different, something that will attract viewers to their station. Almost anyone who wants to do something bizarre on a public street can find his way on television, and be seen by millions or tens of millions of people all over the country, and, indeed, through much of the world.

Because the newspapers are in competition with the television stations, they have to present the same news. Thus, there has been an enormous increase in the opportunity to express dissent, and, perhaps even more important, an even greater increase in the immediacy of dissent and the impact which it can make. There may be real room to ques-

tion whether we have psychologically caught up with the developments in communications' speed and distribution, whether we are capable of absorbing and evaluating all of the materials which are now communicated daily to hundreds of millions of people.

I do not mean to suggest that the communications agencies have acted irresponsibly. They, too, have had to learn their power while the public was beginning to become aware of it. There are clear signs that television and newspapers are aware of their responsibilities in these areas, and are accepting them. There is a hard line for them to follow. For they must serve the ideals of a free press. Yet, all of the problems are enormously magnified, and the essential nature of responsibility in the exercise of a free press stands out more clearly as the magnification increases. The power of communication, through press, radio and television, has become an awesome power. Its use is essential to the preservation of a free society. Only time will tell, I suppose, whether our system can adequately adjust itself to the impact of modern communications methods. I am only trying to point out here the importance of the exercise of responsibility in the expression of dissent in the modern world.

v

We must draw two fundamental distinctions when we speak of dissent; the first involves primarily legal and moral variables and divides permissible from unpermissible dissent; the second presupposes that the dissent is tolerable but involves the social and political considerations of whether, or when or how the protest should be made. The latter is not a question of right, but of judgment and morals, even of taste, and a proper sense of restraint and responsibility, qualities which are or should be inherent in the very concept of civil liberties.

We must begin any analysis of these questions with the undoubted fact that we live in a society, an imperfect and struggling one no doubt, but one where Government and order are not only a necessity but are the preference of an overwhelming majority of the citizenry. The rules that society has developed to organize and order itself are found in a body of law which has not been imposed from outside, but has been slowly built up from experience expressed through the consent of the governed, and now pervades all aspects of human activity. Inevitably there are occasions when individuals or groups will chafe under a particular legal bond, or will bridle in opposition to a particular governmental policy, and the question presents itself, what can be done?

Vocal objection, of course—even slanderous or inane—is permissible. But the fact that one is a dissenter with a right to express his opposition entitles him to no special license. Thus, in expressing views that are themselves wholly immune to official strictures he gains no roving commission to ignore the rules and underlying assumption of society that relate in a neutral way to activity rather than to the maintenance or expression of ideas. Thus, I submit that one cannot rightly engage in conduct which is otherwise unlawful merely because he intends that either that conduct or the idea he wishes to express in the course of the conduct is intended to manifest his dissent from some governmental policy. I cannot distinguish in principle the legal quality of the determination to halt a troop train to protest the Vietnam war or to block workmen from entering a segregated job site to protest employment discrimination, from the determination to fire shots into a civil rights leader's home to protest integration. The right to disagree—and to manifest disagreement—which the constitution allows to the individuals in those situations—does not authorize them to carry on their campaign of education and persuasion at the expense of someone else's liberty, or in violation of some laws whose independent validity is unquestionable.

¹⁰ *The Occasional Speeches of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes* 75 (Howe ed. 1962).

¹¹ *Stromberg v. California*, 283 U.S. 359. Compare *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624.

¹² *People v. Stover*, 12 N.Y. 2d 462, 470, 240 N.Y.S. 2d 734, 191 N.E. 2d 272 (1963), appeal dismissed, 375 U.S. 42.

¹³ Farrell, "Today's Disobedience Is Uncivil," in *On Civil Disobedience*, 1967, N.Y. Times Magazine, November 26, 1967, p. 29.

¹⁴ Rustin, in *Civil Disobedience* 10 (Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions 1966).

¹⁵ *Baumgartner v. United States*, 322 U.S. 665, 673-674. See also *Bridges v. California*, 314 U.S. 252.

¹⁶ *Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 146 (Black, J. dissenting).

¹⁷ See generally *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254.

This distinction runs deep in our history, but has too frequently been ignored in this decade. But the line is a clear one, and we should reestablish it in the thinking and understanding of our people. While I share Professor Harry Kalven's assessment that the "generosity and empathy with which [public streets and parks] are made available [as a "public forum"] is an index of freedom,"¹⁸ I regard as unassailable the limitation that the mere fact that a person wishes to make a public point does not sanction any method he chooses to use to make it. Yet there seems to be currently a considerable tendency to ignore if not to reject this limitation. Certainly many of the modern forms of dissent, including those I have just mentioned, proceed on the basis of the contrary proposition. Only last Term the Supreme Court was asked to sustain the right of demonstrators active in a cause that most of us here and the Court itself no doubt regarded as laudable, to lodge their demand for an end to segregation on the grounds of a city jail where, it seemed, biased treatment was being accorded prisoners. The argument was made that a demonstration at that site was "particularly appropriate," irrespective of the consequences. Speaking for the Court, Justice Black rejected this rationale, explaining that "Such an argument has as its major unarticulated premise the assumption that people who want to propagandize protests or views have a constitutional right to do so whenever and however and wherever they please."

That notion the Court expressly "vigorously and forthrightly rejected."

Another form of protest that can never, in my view, be excused or tolerated, is that which assumes the posture of a violent and forcible assault on public order, whatever the motivation. The interests at stake in such a situation must transcend the validity of the particular cause and the permissibility of adhering to it. Violent opposition to law—any law—or forcible disregard of another's freedom to disagree falls beyond the pale of legitimate dissent or even of civil disobedience, properly understood; it is nothing short of rebellion.

The utter indefensibility of violent opposition to law is that it proceeds on the foolhardy and immoral principle that might makes right. Centuries ago Rousseau rejected this approach as a viable political alternative.²⁰

"For, if force creates right, the effect changes with the cause: every force that is greater than the first succeeds to its right. As soon as it is possible to disobey with impunity, disobedience is legitimate; and, the strongest being always in the right, the only thing that matters is to act so as to become the strongest. But what kind of right is that which perishes when force falls?"

To permit factions the resort to force when they feel—however correctly—that a particular law or policy is wrong would be to renounce our own experience and that of the Founders. In support of this view, I offer two sentences written by Justice Frankfurter: "Law alone saves a society from being rent by internecine strife or ruled by mere brute power however disguised."²¹ And, "Violent resistance to law cannot be made a legal reason for its suspension without loosening the fabric of our society."²²

What is at stake is not mere order but also the lessons of history. True freedom and substantial justice come not from violent altercations or incendiary dissent. "No mob has ever protected any liberty, even its

own."²³ While the First Amendment embodies a distrust of the collective conscience of the majority in areas of fundamental liberty, it no more intended to leave the limits of freedom to the judgment of coercive dissenters. "Civil government cannot let any group ride rough-shod over others simply because their 'consciences' tell them to do so."²⁴

VI

These reflections have dealt with the question when law and government may tolerate dissent, or dissent manifested in certain ways, and I have suggested that it is illicit to violate otherwise valid laws either as a symbol of protest or in the course of protest, and secondly that I regard it as indefensible to attempt to promote a viewpoint either by flagrant violence or by organized coercion. Now I will turn finally to the second distinction to which I referred earlier in this lecture. That is, assuming a legal or moral right to protest, what considerations of prudence and responsibility should infuse the determination to exercise these rights.

First, you will note that I imply that a line may be drawn between legal and moral rights to dissent. I am not now referring to what I accept as the genuine possibility that one may exercise his constitutional right to dissent in a way that, because of recklessness or unfairness, makes his conduct ethically improper. I mention this distinction, however, because I believe awareness and evaluation of it should always be taken into account in considering an exercise of the right to dissent. But for the present, I mean to concentrate on the converse of this distinction, that there may be a moral right to dissent without a corresponding legal privilege to do so. It is in this context that "civil disobedience" must be viewed.

Earlier, I observed that our system contemplates that there may be a moral right to "civil disobedience" (properly understood) that exists notwithstanding a "legal" duty to obey. I also referred to the source of this moral right: the ultimate sanctity of a man's own conscience, as the intellectual and volitional composite that governs his conception of his relation to Eternal Truth. I wish now to emphasize the considerations which, in my view, condition the existence and exercise of this moral right, because I believe the current rhetoric—which sometimes seems to consecrate "civil disobedience" as the noblest response in the pantheon of virtues—has obscured the nature and consequence of this activity. To define my term—I mean by "civil disobedience" the deliberate violation of a rule ordained by constituted government because of a conscientious conviction that the law is so unjust that it cannot morally be observed by the individual.

The most important point to be stressed is that this decision is one that should be made only after the most painful and introspective reflection, and only when the firm conclusion is reached that obedience offends the most fundamental personal values. It is self-evident that routine or random non-compliance with the law for transient or superficial reasons would negate the first principles of civilized behavior. Unless society can safely assume that almost without exception individuals will accept the will of the majority even when to do so is grudging and distasteful, the foundation of secure liberty will rather rapidly erode. John Locke, who in his profound *Letter Concerning Toleration* analyzed and defended the right of obedience to conscience over civil law in case of severe conflict, thereafter cautioned in his essay *Concerning Civil Government*:²⁵

"May [the sovereign] be resisted, as often as any one shall find himself aggrieved, and

but imagine he has not right done him? This will unhinge and overturn all polities, and instead of government and order, leave nothing but anarchy and confusion."

Last year, in delivering this Lecture, Arthur Goodhart observed, "Thus, it has been correctly said that obedience to the law is a major part of patriotism."²⁶ He meant this not as a castigation of dissent or as an outburst of flag-waving chauvinism, but rather as a formulation of a central political truth: That if human society is to enjoy freedom, it cannot tolerate license. Henry David Thoreau is generally regarded as the most notable American exponent of civil disobedience, and all of us share admiration for his determination. But we must not ignore the vital aspect of Thoreau's non-conformity—his passionate attempt to dissociate himself from society. He was, as Harry Kalven has put it, "a man who does not see himself as belonging very intensely to the community in which he was raised,"²⁷ and who sought constantly but futilely to reject the society to which he had not voluntarily adhered.

Thoreau's poignant attitude was charming enough in mid-nineteenth century America. But it was, essentially, an effort to withdraw from the realities of life and it was, I suggest, myopic even then, for it was painfully inconsistent with the fact that man is a part of society by nature, by geography, and by citizenship. Unlike a member of a purely artificial group, like a bar association or country club, a citizen cannot resign from the "social compact" because he protests policies of the regime. Now in the last third of the Twentieth Century, we must be even more cognizant that there is nothing noble or salutary about foredoomed attempts to abdicate membership in society. Complex problems demand rational attention that can come only from personal focus on solutions and never from stubbornly turning one's back on harsh and unpleasant realities.

This is precisely what non-conformity as a way of life is. It is the essential irrationality of the "hippie movement"—a mass endeavor to drop out of life. It is a protest of sorts, of course, but one that can bear no fruit, because it takes issue with what is not only inevitable, but more importantly, indispensable—social regulation of individual behavior.

Stretched to its logical extreme, this also is civil disobedience, and for this reason I urge that before any man embarks upon a unilateral nullification of any law he must appreciate that his judgment has not merely a personal significance but also portends grave consequences for his fellows.

In determining whether and when to exercise the moral right to disobey the dictates of the law, it must also be recognized that society not only does not but cannot recognize this determination as entitled to legal privilege. It is part of the Gandhian tradition of civil disobedience that the sincerity of the individual's conscience presupposes that the law will punish this assertion of personal principle. In the very formation of our country, in the Federalist Papers, Hamilton explained the reason why government cannot compromise its authority by offering a dispensation for individual conscience:²⁸

"Government implies the power of making laws. It is essential to the idea of a law, that it be attended with a sanction; or, in other words, a penalty or punishment for disobedience. If there be no penalty annexed to disobedience, the resolutions or commands which pretend to be laws will, in fact, amount to nothing more than advice or recommendation."

¹⁸ Kalven, *The Concept of the Public Forum: Cox v. Louisiana*, 1965 Supreme Court Review 12.

¹⁹ *Adderly v. Florida*, 385 U.S. 39, 47-48.

²⁰ *The Social Contract*, Bk. I, Ch. 3.

²¹ *United States v. United Mine Workers*, 330 U.S. 258, 308.

²² *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 22.

²³ *Terminiello v. Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1, 32 (Jackson, J., dissenting).

²⁴ *Douglas v. City of Jeannette*, 319 U.S. 157, 179 (opinion of Jackson, J.).

²⁵ Ch. XVIII, para. 203.

²⁶ *Recognition of the Binding Nature of Law*, 41 Tul. L. Rev. 769, 773 (1967).

²⁷ "On Thoreau" in *Civil Disobedience*, 25, 28 (Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions 1966).

²⁸ *The Federalist*, Number 15.

Thus, it is of the essence of law that it is equally applied to all, that it binds all alike, irrespective of personal motive. For this reason, one who contemplates civil disobedience out of moral conviction should not be surprised and must not be bitter if a criminal conviction ensues. And he must accept the fact that organized society cannot endure on any other basis. His hope is that he may aid in getting the law changed. But if he does not succeed in that, he cannot complain if the law is applied to him.

VII

Though I speak with seriousness about civil disobedience, I hope that my remarks are not misunderstood. I endeavored to make it plain in my opening analysis that a proper recognition of the rights of conscience is one of the basic assumptions of our society. The problem, of course, is to determine what is "proper." Like all questions worth discussing, it is inevitably one of degree.

In considering this question, it is well to examine not only *whether* civil disobedience is appropriate in a particular situation, but also *how* it is to be carried out. We have a vivid illustration of this in the experience of this generation. We are all aware of the fact that for many long years the legal structure was often used to perpetuate deprivations which were at odds with the most basic constitutional and moral values. During this time, conditions of political, social, and economic inequality made ineffective meaningful attempts to change these regulations and policies by petition within the customary channels of reform. In this situation, the only realistic recourse was deliberate refusal to abide by the restrictions any longer. Lunch-counter sit-ins and freedom rides are among the most dramatic examples of the techniques that were used to expose the injustices that were perpetrated under the banner of law. In many of these cases, these actions were not, indeed, illegal, since the restrictive laws were plainly invalid if one had the time, energy, and money to take them up to higher courts. In other cases, though, the line was not clear, and sometimes the actions taken were undoubtedly illegal. We cannot fail to recognize the fact that it was these tactics which succeeded in putting the basic issues squarely before the courts and the public. And it was in this way that the law was clarified in the courts and that legislative changes were brought about.

There are great lessons to be learned from this experience. Perhaps the greatest of these is that what mattered was not merely the moral fervor of the demonstrators, or the justice of their cause, but also the way in which they conducted themselves. They and their leaders were aware of the moral dimensions of their cause, and they knew that this required an equal adherence to morality in the means by which they sought to vindicate their cause. Because of this, rigid adherence to the philosophy of non-violence was sought and widely achieved. In retrospect, I am sure that our Nation will point with pride not only to the courage of those who risked punishment in order to challenge injustice, but also to the morality of their actions in scrupulously avoiding violence, even in reaction to the force which was exerted on them. The affirmation of the close relation between morality and non-violence will be one of the many monuments of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As this experience shows, the ultimate legal success as well as the intrinsic moral quality of civil disobedience turns on the restraint with which it is exercised. This is an extremely hard line to draw, but it is one which must be earnestly sought out. Unfortunately, some of those who claim this mantle today do not appreciate the moral quality of thought and action which made their predecessors worthy to wear it.

Of course, it has not been my intention to

disparage the objectives of any individual or group, or to discourage the honest and forthright and candid prophylaxis and therapy that are the legacy of reflective and constructive criticism. My only concern has been that some contemporary forms and philosophies of protest may in fact unwittingly retard the improvements in society which we all seek. I hope the ideas I have sought to present here may contribute to the thoughtful consideration of critical issues with which we must all deal in the creative evolution of our cherished land.

Constitutional Americanism

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as colleagues representing districts of small communities and rural areas know well, there are few better examples of meeting a community need by voluntary community action than the volunteer fire companies of our Nation.

There is hard work to be found in these organizations, but there is time for humor, too, and for forthright discussion of public questions in which the visitor, if he is a willing listener, can receive a cross section of opinion on how things are going, or how they should go, in the United States.

I had opportunity, recently, to attend the annual banquet of the Flint Hill, Va., Volunteer Fire Department, where the principal speaker was James J. "Jack" Crawford, who is editor and general manager of the Northern Virginia Daily, published in my home community of Strasburg, Va.

Because I found it an interesting and hopeful statement of the enduring quality of "Constitutional Americanism," I take the liberty of commending it to the House at this time:

CONSTITUTIONAL AMERICANISM

In view of the turmoil which has beset our land these past few weeks, it may be difficult to remember that we have a Constitution.

But, we have!

And, at the outset, let me say it is comforting to know that after the emotionalism which rules today's events subsides, we will, you may be sure, return to the basis of our constitutional heritage.

Let's examine the record of history and see how our Constitution has weathered many storms, and, at the same time, grown apace. In the relatively short life of our American Republic there have been many restless times.

In 1776 through 1783, when our forefathers brought forth this nation out of revolution and, down through the nearly 200 years which have followed—through the vicissitudes of maturing—disagreements, sometimes violent disagreements, have been a part of our national life and growth.

We have seen eras of quiet progress and we have seen periods of violent change. Each of the periods has affected the Constitution in its own way.

Our own War Between the States was four years of bloody conflict that was a most severe testing of a nation of free men.

Then, there was World War I, which witnessed the emergence of the United States as a world power with which to reckon.

And, World War II which confirmed the place of the United States as the world's most powerful nation and with it imposed upon

our nation a whole new set of values and responsibilities.

Then came the Korean War, euphemistically referred to as a police action, and of course, today, Vietnam. However one may wish to categorize Korea and Vietnam—the United States is and was involved in these two conflicts because of this country's responsibilities as a world power.

Then there has been a procession of conflicts not on the battlefield.

For instance, the peacetime birth and expansion of the American labor movement, starting at the close of the War Between the States and continuing for approximately 40 years, is an example of another kind of violent upheaval in this nation's growth.

In this struggle, men who had nothing to fight with but the desire for a better life struggled upward toward the goal.

There was violence in these early struggles of labor to organize for representation. This was a revolution of sorts.

The push westward at the close of the war, and the pioneer settlement of the vast reaches of territory west of the Mississippi, against great odds, is another example of America maturing. And, indeed, this, too, was often a violent and painful process.

Through good times and bad, peaceful and tremulous, our nation has gone through the process of growing up and measuring up.

And we learned in our early school days that through it all, our nation, the government, the courts and the people have leaned upon the most unique instrument of government ever devised, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as the rugged foundation of democracy upon which to build permanently.

And so it is—though the Constitution has been subjected to generations of judicial probing, and the attacks of varied political philosophies, it has withstood. For, through times of deviousness, it is not the Constitution itself which is wanting. It stands despite the diverse views that assail it.

The trouble comes from the interpretations which men put upon it in seeking to weave new threads of social and political justice into the national fabric. Sometimes it seems it is not a time of weaving at all, but a time of unravelling threads already sewn by previous carefully contrived interpretations.

Whatever it is, my friends, there is little doubt we are again living in a time of vast change, a time of social upheaval, a time in which a revolution of sorts stalks the land.

The American political system requires rebels who will continually argue the case against the status quo, formulate alternatives and try to create a constituency committed to those alternatives. When this kind of skepticism and resistance to established authority ceases, democracy becomes a mere facade for preserving the status quo—as, indeed, some radicals think it has.

Yet at the same time every political system also needs dutiful civil servants who will carry out whatever program their political superiors inaugurate. If every civil servant had strong convictions of his own and then blocked anything which did not conform to these convictions, politics would become meaningless.

America has been built on a mixture of discipline and rebellion, but the balance between them has constantly shifted over the years.

During the nineteen-forties and fifties the anti-authoritarian side of the American tradition lay politically dormant. Politicians and voters were mainly concerned with national security and prosperity. Conservatives expressed some alarm when pursuit of these objectives led to the growth and centralization of government power, and liberals expressed similar alarm when it led to the growth and centralization of corporate power, but almost nobody opposed either trend in any serious way.

The nineteen-sixties, on the other hand, have seen a spectacular revival of the anti-authoritarian tradition. The most visible spokesman today for this revival are black militants. These groups have produced a time of national stress with which we are all familiar.

Some call it the black man's revolution. More moderate advocates call it the black man's reach for a place in the sun, a place too long denied him. In any case, this revolution, if indeed it is a revolution, is said to be an inevitable swing of the pendulum toward justice and equality for all Americans. Like the struggle of the American labor movement, what is happening today is an unavoidable part of our evolutionary maturing.

It is, of course, history that the stage for today's events was set in 1954 when the Supreme Court handed down its now famous decision barring segregation in the public schools.

The immediate result of this far-reaching decision was that it created a vacuum which resulted from the inability of many of our states, both in the north and in the south, to carry out the dictum of the court "with all deliberate speed." In filling the vacuum the court has, since 1954 delivered itself of a rash of additional decisions which strike at what to a great many Americans is the traditional meeting of the Constitution.

As a result, our people are confused. They are bewildered by a steady flow of what appear to be court-inspired paradoxes. For example, we are told that it is unconstitutional to have publicly authorized prayer in the public schools. This seems to deny God. By the same token, the court has also said that a man cannot be barred from holding a job, even a sensitive job, in a defense plant simply because he is a Communist. This seems to aid our enemies.

Paradox after paradox appears to strike at the very heart of the order we conceive is necessary if we are to preserve our integrity as a nation.

The court has sanctioned wholly new concepts of social and political behavior undreamed of in our fathers' day.

Many of our citizens, though sympathetic to the black man's position in our society do not understand the seeming urgency on the part of the court to suddenly right all the wrongs which it conceives to exist. Especially since the very existence of these so-called wrongs is for the most part soundly based on previous decisions of a long procession of equally exalted Supreme Courts.

What are we to think of today's revolution? Was it violent treatment of the Constitution itself which brought it about? Many authorities think so; many feel that violence has been done, not once but many times, and that it was often dictated by political expediency. The question is certainly debatable.

However, I strongly believe that the struggle we are witnessing today is just another step forward in the process of national maturing, one which had to come sooner or later. It was just a question of when. And, this struggle will pass because it will also be resolved. The promise of equality, of opportunity, as well as citizenship will be fulfilled, because in a virile democracy, it must.

But, the very nature of the problem suggests the need for time. The greatest danger today is the unabiding impatience of civil libertarians and civil rights leaders, many of whom are more political opportunists than seekers after justice.

These are the people who threaten to burn down our cities unless their demands are met at once. These are some of the leaders who are even now directing a gigantic demonstration of the poor to take place in already ravaged Washington—the purpose of which they unabashedly tell us, is to force Congress to grant their demands for a guaranteed wage and more jobs.

This is the kind of pressure which is nothing more than an attempt to get legislation by intimidation.

Some of these are the people who would use the revolution to build "Black Power" into a sinister force. Don't misunderstand me, I am for Black Power. I am for the kind of Black Power which produces men like Sen. Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, Mayor Claude Stokes of Cleveland, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Thurgood Marshall, and countless Negro athletes, professional men, businessmen, men of science, and men of letters, etc. These men represent constructive Black Power. All of these men, and many others, are as much a credit to their country as they are to their race. I am for this kind of constructive Black Power.

I am against the Black Power of Adam Clayton Powell, Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown. Theirs is a destructive approach which will not only harm their country, but the cause they profess to represent as well.

What is the rationale for the militancy of pressure tactics employed by many civil rights leaders today? If we could break it down into parts, what part of the exhibition such as is now being planned for Washington is motivated by love of equality and justice and what part by opportunism. We may never know the whole answer to this, at least not in contemporary times.

However, we do know that in between the militant far-left civil rights groups and the far-right conservatives there is a third group. A very important and a very representative third group.

These are the millions of Americans, Negro and white, who are uncommitted to either side, who do not think of themselves as either conservatives or liberals, who do not consider themselves either black or white racists, whose views of contemporary civil rights problems, social justice and equal opportunity are that these questions must and will be worked out. These are the people who are saying—O.K.—let's get with it. Let's solve our problems but let's do it within the framework of the Constitution.

These are the people, and there are many constitutional authorities among them, who believe that though the Constitution confers equal rights upon every citizen, it does not confer upon anyone the right to substitute the rule of force for the rule of law.

They believe the Constitution does not envision rule by pressure groups, or legislation by intimidation, or that all the ills of our society can be cured by Executive fiat or judicial dictum. I think these Americans believe, as I do, that the Constitution does not confer absolute rights on anyone, white or black.

They believe, as I do, that freedom cannot become license for license can easily be used to abort the very blessings that freedom is meant to give. They believe, as I believe, that the Constitution meant to measure the freedoms it guarantees. By this I mean that there are no freedoms which are completely uninhibited and without any restrictions imposed upon the citizens who would enjoy them. No one may run around helter-skelter irresponsibly using his constitutional freedoms in such a manner as to injure his neighbor, though some are trying, as has always been the case in each stage of our nation's history.

No one may do these things we say, yet for the past decade we have witnessed instance after instance in case after case, in which our Supreme Court has appeared to refute that doctrine. It is perhaps the crowning paradox of our age that the court has sometimes seemed to pursue a double standard.

Though I do not claim to be an expert in the intricacies of constitutional law, I think that it requires a good deal less than legal genius to recognize the fact that in the orgies of civil disorders, trespass on private prop-

erty, demonstrations—often uncontrolled demonstrations—which have frequently made a mockery of public property and hallowed shrines—and which have frequently brought the functional life in our cities to a standstill and have impeded government—that all of these things do violence to the constitutional rights of others.

These things we have experienced and we have found no relief in many cases, and this makes one wonder if, indeed, there is a double standard. It is almost impossible sometimes to escape the conviction that this is so.

And, yet, I believe it is logical to say that what is happening today is a part of the maturing process of our nation, and not the end of the line as some predict. Because, judges are transitory, political philosophies change, but the fundamental law as expressed in the Constitution has remained immutable from all the assaults which have been made upon it. It will continue to do so.

The Constitution is based upon the most reasonable, most mature and at the same time the most visionary concepts of men. Among these is the right and the duty of men to reason together for the good of the whole community.

Ladies and gentlemen—in summary, let me say—

We have seen violence to our democratic system in the attacks made on religion in the name of religious freedom. We have seen it in the attacks made on private property rights in the name of civil rights. We have seen it in the undermining of patriotism by maladjusted, flag defiling, draft card burning dissidents parading in the name of freedom to dissent. We have seen all of this and we wonder what is happening to our democracy.

But we must not underrate the dynamics of democracy—the very fluidity in the ebb and flow of change today, and the adjustments which we have and are making to meet that change. For the dynamics assert themselves in the underlying fact that our constitutional form of government is resilient. The Constitution is living law. If it were not, we would have long since perished.

Our Constitution, thank God, can and will survive the tests, the stresses and the strains to which it is now being subjected. It has survived far greater tests.

We will not only emerge, we will emerge stronger than before.

At least, this is the way I see it.

Glory

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess, it was my privilege to hear a fired-up recitation of the following poem. Upon learning that the young lady had also written it, I was so touched that I wanted to share it with my colleagues. The author and rhetorical speaker is 9-year-old Deborah Leigh Waldrop, 4116 Appalachian Way, Columbus, Ga.:

GLORY

Glory, oh! Glory! way up in the sky,
Tell me, answer me, why, oh why,
Does man tend to ignore your glorious cry,
Of freedom, and justice and liberty to live
by?
Tho' slavery and sorrow this country hath
bound,
A truth, a light, has always been found,
O' Glory, fly high, and proud, and true,
So all may see the red, white and blue!

Hungry Americans

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last week Members of Congress have received copies of two reports issued by private organizations on the subject of hunger in these United States. The most recent, issued by the Citizens' Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, is a sweeping indictment of the myth that no American goes to bed hungry. This report flatly asserts:

First. There is a shocking absence of knowledge in this country about the extent and severity of hunger and malnutrition.

Second. Federal food programs fail to reach a significant portion of the poor, and many of those aided are not helped in any substantial degree.

Third. Millions of Americans suffer hunger and malnutrition and these conditions are increasing both in degree and numbers annually.

Fourth. Hunger and malnutrition, here as elsewhere in the world, take their toll in infant deaths, organic brain damage, retarded growth, and impaired ability to learn.

The dimensions of the problem strain credulity. A 1965 U.S. Department of Agriculture survey showed that 10.7-million Americans were eating two-thirds or less of the minimum daily dietary requirements, and another 9.2 million were eating less than the satisfactory levels. Yet only 5.4-million people were participating in Federal food programs in 1967. It is impossible to tell whether these were a part of or in addition to the 19.9 million who fail to achieve the minimum nutritional requirements. However, the few studies which have been done show that the present programs do not appreciably affect the recipients' diet, from which it seems fair to assume that a substantial portion of hungry Americans are participants in the Federal food programs.

The second report issued on April 16 by the Committee on School Lunch Participation concentrates on the operation and effectiveness of the national school lunch program. This report also indicts the comfortable assumption that all American schoolchildren participate in the program. This group finds:

First. Only 18.5 million schoolchildren benefit from the program.

Second. Fewer than 2 million children receive reduced price or free lunches, yet there are more than 6 million poor children of school age.

Third. The participation in the program is lowest where the need is greatest—geographically in the urban ghettos and isolated rural areas, and age-wise among the youngest children in the elementary grades.

I stress that these reports are the work of private citizens who have donated their time and talents to accumulate information which has been published with funds from private sources. Those responsible for this contribution, as listed

at the close of my remarks, deserve a grateful vote of thanks from the Congress. That they had to perform this service is a sad commentary on the efficiency of the Government over which we preside.

Few of us will agree in every detail with the findings and conclusions of these groups. Indeed, I differ with many of the recommendations, and question some of the findings. Both of these groups have dealt with areas of our national life which suffer from lack of scientific investigation or reliable statistical data. Moreover, they have been compelled to function without the authority of the Government to reinforce their investigative efforts.

On the other hand, none can read the results of this work without concluding that a problem of staggering magnitude has been vividly outlined. None can refute that immediate action of both long and short range is demanded.

Both of these citizens committees urge intensive study of the problem on a well-funded national basis. I believe this can best be accomplished by a national commission authorized and financed by the Congress similar in kind and scope to the National Commission on Mental Health and Illness established by President Eisenhower. In the short range, I urge that the Committee on Education and Labor hold hearings to determine the short-range administrative improvements which can enhance the effectiveness of existing programs, and lay some foundation for legislative change.

From the inception of the poverty hearings in 1964, I have joined with many of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee in urging such an intensive study of the problems of poverty, its incidence, its composition, the effectiveness of existing programs, and new measures for its alleviation and elimination. We did not know then and we do not now know who the poor are or where they are located with sufficient accuracy to say that this child or that family is or is not receiving the assistance that the peculiar circumstances of the situation demand.

Nothing could demonstrate this need more accurately than these two reports. It is abundantly clear that we do not know who among the undernourished poor are receiving nutritional assistance. Moreover, it is impossible to determine if the assistance extended in fact alleviates the problem. Despite this astonishing ignorance of program effectiveness, we spend upward of \$317 million annually in money and commodities in the food stamp and surplus commodities programs.

The administration of the national school lunch program is even more astonishing. It demonstrates the same ignorance of program effectiveness, but demonstrates also the absence of realistic priorities, a failure to conform with the declared intent of both the Congress and the Executive, and the administrative confusion which prevails through so many of the social welfare agencies. Moreover, there is absent any evidence of an effort to integrate this program into the broad policy of alleviating poverty.

I have been long concerned with the

failure of our poverty programs to focus on the very young among the poor. These should be the highest priority groups. Almost without exception, the experts advise that both humanitarian considerations and cost effectiveness dictate this course. In the field of nutrition, there can be no doubt that adequate nourishment for young people is of vital importance in breaking the cycle of poverty. Malnutrition invites retarded growth, both mental and physical, thus inviting a nonproductive maturity. Less serious degrees of hunger cause a dulling of perception, thus thwarting the efforts of the schools to provide education for future self-sufficiency. The psychological impact of hunger on the youthful mind is unexplored, but it seems a safe assumption that it invites alienation, despair, and the delinquency and destructiveness which can flow therefrom.

The national school lunch program offers the unique vehicle for nutritional support of schoolage poor children. It is possible today to provide the minimum daily dietary requirements for normal growth in a single meal. The schools are the single institution which provides contact with the great majority of young people in poverty. It is logical to assume that a national school lunch program would provide reduced price or free meals for the more than 6 million schoolage among the young who are poor. However it does not.

Data available in Washington reveals only that one-eighth of the children served received free or reduced cost meals. There is no information available to establish how many are free. According to the school lunch committee the vast majority of these students receive only a reduced price. Moreover there are no established national standards. Thus the committee reports that in many areas those who receive welfare payments are excluded from the free lunch program. Here again it is impossible to determine if the assistance offered is in fact reaching those in greatest need. In addition to this sorry fact, we are told that the program is least effective in the elementary schools in isolated rural areas and the urban ghettos. Apparently this situation results from a combination of inadequate funds and lack of cafeterias. Notable efforts have been made in New York City and elsewhere to provide "sack lunches" in the urban ghettos, but the program still fails to reach vast numbers of children. We are, in short, spending at the level of about \$350 million annually on this program which offers major potential in the battle against poverty, yet it is neither focused on the problem nor integrated with the overall program effort.

It must be noted that much of the confusion emanates from the legislative history of the major food programs, which were conceived first as a method of utilizing agricultural surpluses and only secondarily for social betterment. While some reorientation has occurred in recent years, the program funding flows to a level of about 50 percent from an allocation of tariff collections, and thus escapes the scrutiny of either legislative review or the Appropriations Commit-

tees. The program has never become an integral aspect of the legislative determination to eliminate poverty and accordingly remains largely outside of the massive concentration of money and resources so directed today. This is a condition which demands our immediate attention, and our considered action.

CITIZENS' BOARD OF INQUIRY INTO HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES

Benjamin E. Mays, Co-Chairman, President Emeritus, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia.

Leslie W. Dunbar, Co-Chairman, Executive Director, The Field Foundation, New York, New York.

MEMBERS

Harry S. Ashore, Author, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California.

James P. Carter, M.D., Pediatrician, Division of Nutrition, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

Rt. Rev. Daniel Corrigan, Director, Home Department, Executive Council of the Episcopal Church, New York, New York.

Norman Dorsen, Professor of Law and Director, Arthur Garfield Hays Civil Liberties Program, New York University School of Law, New York, New York.

Rashl Fein, Senior Staff Member for Economic Studies, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

M. Alfred Haynes, M.D., Associate Professor of International Health, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland.

Vivian W. Henderson, President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia.

Fay Bennett, Executive Secretary, National Sharecroppers Fund, New York, New York.

Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C.

Vine Deloria, Jr., Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians, Denver, Colorado.

George H. Esser, Executive Director, The North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina.

Stanley N. Gershoff, Associate Professor of Nutrition, Harvard University, School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts.

Ralph Helstein, President, United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers, Chicago, Illinois.

Dolores Huerta, Secretary, United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, Delano, California.

Harry Huge, Attorney, Arnold & Porter, Washington, D.C.

Rabbi Robert Kahn, Congregation Emanuel, Houston, Texas.

James O'Connor, President, American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, New York, New York.

Gilbert Ortiz, M.D., Chairman of ASPIRA, Bronx, New York.

Edward Sparer, Professor of Law, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Walter Mitchell, President, International Chemical Workers Union, Akron, Ohio.

Milton Ogle, Executive Director, Appalachian Volunteers, Bristol, Tennessee.

Philip Sorensen, Executive Director, Irwin-Sweeney-Miller Foundation, Columbus, Indiana.

Raymond Wheeler, M.D., Charlotte Medical Clinic, Charlotte, North Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL LUNCH PARTICIPATION CHURCH WOMEN UNITED

Mrs. Margaret M. Morris, Project Director, National Committee on Household Employment; formerly, Chief of Technical Services, National School Lunch Program, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Technical Secretary for Home and Community, President's Commission on the Status of Women; Home Economics Consultant, President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

Mrs. Katharine P. Riddle, Associate Secretary and Home Economist, Committee on Agriculture and Rural Life, Division of Overseas Ministries, National Council of Churches of Christ/USA; nutrition consultant, Church Women United.

NATIONAL BOARD OF THE Y.W.C.A.

Julia F. Allen, Dean of Women, Emeritus, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky; member, Executive Committee, National Board of the Y.W.C.A.; member, Board, Central Kentucky Civil Liberties Union.

Dorothy B. Ferebee, M.D., Assistant Professor of Preventive Medicine and Medical Supervisor of Health Activities, Howard University, Washington, D.C.; Medical Consultant, U.S. Department of State and Peace Corps and U.S. delegate, World Health Organization Assembly, 1967; President, Southeast (Washington) Settlement House; former Medical Director, Mississippi Health Project; National Chairman of Publications, Y.W.C.A.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

Sister Melathion Helster, C.S.C.; M.S.W. Director, Sisters Urban Center, Washington, D.C.; Assistant Director, Southeast (Washington) Catholic Center; member, Archdiocesan Board of Education; formerly, teacher, elementary school principal and superintendent of a boys' home; articles in *Catholic Charities Review* and *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin*.

Mrs. Maxwell H. Stokes, National Director, National Council of Catholic Women; Secretary, District of Columbia Public Welfare Advisory Council; Treasurer, National Christ Child Society.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

Mrs. William J. Cooper, Education System Representative, Burroughs Corporation; Program Adviser, Omaha Job Corps Center for Women; corporate member and first President, Women in Community Services (WICS); formerly member, National Board of the National Council of Jewish Women.

Mrs. Daniel Schreiber, Chairman, Education Subcommittee, Program Development Committee, National Council of Jewish Women; member, Inter-Religious Relations Committee, National Community Relations Advisory Council; corrective reading teacher, ESEA (Title I) program, New York City.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN

Janet L. Douglass, Projector Director, National Council of Negro Women; member, Board of the Association of Black Social Workers.

Mrs. Dorothy Shad Proctor, School psychologist and former teacher, public schools, Washington, D.C.; member, Board of Directors, Social Hygiene Society of Metropolitan Washington and Ionia Whipper Home for Unwed Mothers; National Consumer Representative, National Council of Negro Women.

CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL LUNCH PARTICIPATION

Jean Fairfax, Director, Division of Legal Information and Community Service, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; delegate, Fourth Assembly, World Council of Churches, 1968; formerly, National Representative for Southern Programs, Community Relations Division, American Friends Service Committee; Vice-Chairman, Council for Christian Social, United Church of Christ.

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's Fine Career

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Larry O'Brien has enjoyed a very brilliant career in public service.

He has been an outstanding political leader, a close, valued friend, confidant, and remarkably successful campaign manager and assistant for our great, dearly beloved, late colleague, and admired leader and friend, President John F. Kennedy.

Postmaster General, Cabinet member, and head of our greatest postal system in the world for the past 6 years, Larry O'Brien is recognized as one of the greatest, most efficient, esteemed, and humane of all the able, distinguished men who have held this most powerful, indispensable Cabinet office. He has been a loyal, trusted, valuable member of our great President's official family.

A resourceful, wise, and just administrator, considerate of his staff and the personnel of the huge complex system under his charge, Postmaster General O'Brien has inaugurated many modern improvements in the Department that have efficiently adapted its functions to the marked growth in its workload that has taken place during his tenure.

His regime will stand out for its modern approach in streamlining this great organization that is so vital to the American people and our Nation.

In expressing my regret that Larry has decided to leave the Post Office Department at this time, I can well understand his desire to launch his career in private business and perhaps resume his interest and participation in active politics, to which he is so deeply committed.

I heartily congratulate Postmaster General O'Brien on his fine, constructive, memorable administration of the great Post Office Department—where he leaves a deep, enduring impression—and I wish for him, his gracious wife and helpmate, and lovely family, continued good health, success in their endeavors, and prosperity, happiness, and peace together for many years to come. Happy landings, Larry.

Louisiana Joins Ranks of Concerned

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that another State public service commission has adopted a resolution concerning the serious situation facing our Nation's railroads.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the resolution of the Louisiana Public Service Commission follows:

RESOLUTION, LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Whereas, the Interstate Commerce Commission, acting under Section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C., Sec. 13a), has permitted the discontinuance of hundreds of passenger trains in the past several years with the result that rail passenger service is at best sparse throughout the Nation and in some areas has ceased to exist; and

Whereas, the rising tide of passenger train discontinuances has been intensified by the policy of the United States Post Office Department regarding the removal of the mail from passenger trains; and

Whereas, this Commission and its sister State regulatory agencies within the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) are vitally concerned with the development of a sound and adequate rail passenger service which will be responsive to the needs of a growing America; and

Whereas, we believe that the decline in the use of rail passenger service is merely a temporary episode in the Nation's transportation history because our crowded airways and clogged highways will not be equal to tomorrow's transportation tasks; and

Whereas, the preservation of safe, dependable, all-weather mass rail passenger service is essential not only to the traveling public, but also to the national defense; and

Whereas, Japan's Tokaido Line and the European railroads prove the feasibility and desirability of modern rail passenger systems; and

Whereas, it is crucial to the future welfare of America that the Congress now take prompt action to conserve a nucleus of rail passenger service to provide the foundation for expanding to meet tomorrow's transportation needs, otherwise an enormous expenditure of government funds will be required in the future to restore essential passenger service now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Louisiana Public Service Commission hereby strongly urges the Congress of the United States to promptly enact legislation imposing a moratorium on rail passenger service discontinuances pending the completion of a study, and the submission of recommendations thereon, by the Department of Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, relative to practical means for preserving essential real passenger service, and the role best suited for rail passenger service in joining with other modes to meet America's growing transportation needs; and be it further

Resolved, that this Commission hereby strongly urges the Congress to promptly amend Section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act as proposed by S. 1685 (introduced by Senator Case of New Jersey on May 4, 1967) and as further proposed by the NARUC in testimony before the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives relative to multi-State passenger train discontinuance petitions being first heard and determined by State joint boards with aggrieved parties having right of appeal to the ICC for correction of errors of law; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of this Resolution be furnished to the Governor of Louisiana, Members of the United States Congressional Delegation of this State, to Members of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, and to the press.

By order of the commission: Baton Rouge, Louisiana, April 1, 1968.

L. T. RAND,
Secretary.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are few events in recent history which will be remembered with such great emotion as the tragic and brave struggle of the Polish Jews of Warsaw in the spring of

1943, which began on April 19. One need not visit Warsaw, where even today the memorial to the victims of Nazi brutality stands on a plain of rubble, to visualize the devastation and horror perpetrated by the insane world vision of the Third German Reich. Documents, diaries, and memoirs which survive the holocaust are vivid testimony to the unlimited suffering of the ghetto prisoners. Never has a people so greatly oppressed suffered with greater dignity and defiance than did the Jews of Poland. In paying tribute to those who died in Warsaw, we also grieve for those other thousands of Polish Jews pressed into the ghettos of Lodz, Lublin, Cracow, Czestochowa, Kielce, and Vilna, as well as the Jewish populations of every other country under German occupation during the war.

Of Warsaw, one journalist who lived there in 1958 and 1959, A. M. Rosenthal, wrote in the New York Times:

There was once a Jewish tang to Warsaw, a ferment, a bustle, a shrill wonderment . . . The taste still lingers, but faintly. There are Jews in Poland, some 20,000 of them, who live with their Jewishness, and some few thousand more who try to forget it, but no real flavor of Warsaw's Jewishness survives the fire.

The statistics alone are incredible. In August 1939, there were 3½ million Jews in Poland; during the war, between 2½ and 3 million were exterminated in the death camps, those compounds of horror scientifically designed for the purpose of efficient murder on a massive scale.

On October 16, 1940, the Germans began collecting the Jews of Warsaw in a 100-square-block area of the city. In November of that year, the 450,000 ghetto inhabitants were sealed off from the rest of the city by a wall. The ultimate purpose was to starve the population. When this proved ineffective, the Nazis began removing the ghetto inhabitants to Treblinka and other camps in Poland. Initially the Jews went willingly, preferring the hardship of a labor camp to the hunger, sickness, and despair of the ghetto. Between July and October, an average of 10,000 people a day were sent away. When news began to come back that those who left were being murdered, all hope of salvation through cooperation was relinquished. In July 1942, a group of young men in the ghetto formed the Jewish fighting organization under the command of Mordechai Anielewicz. Arms were painstakingly smuggled into the sector through the sewers, and primitive weapons were constructed.

When a detachment of SS troops entered the ghetto on January 18, they were greeted with unexpected gunfire and quickly withdrew. Himmler responded by ordering the complete destruction of the enclosed area, and Lieutenant General Stroop was called from German headquarters in Greece to conduct the operation. On Passover Eve, April 19, 1943, German troops surrounded the walls and attacked early the following morning. On April 23, the Germans began the block-by-block destruction of the ghetto, using tanks and firebombs against the meager hand weapons of the Jews. Despite the overwhelming odds, the ghetto resisted until May 16. Those who remained alive took their own lives rather than surrender.

Over 50,000 died; only a handful of men escaped.

Mankind must never forget the Warsaw ghetto uprising. One sometimes hears the words, "we did not know what was happening." But never again should these words be used. We must be vigilant to the dangers of demagoguery, of mass movements dedicated to evil purposes, of germinating prejudice and of claiming uninvolved in issues not of immediate, personal concern.

The Congress of the United States on August 13, 1964, passed a joint resolution requesting the President to designate a day between April 8 and May 6 each year to observe the Warsaw ghetto uprising. This day must be symbolic of our continual remembrance and constant determination that no similar tragedy will ever again scar the progress of civilization. The deep shame cannot be limited to a particular day; the human heart observes no calendar.

Essay Contest Winners

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association, dedicated to the best interests of the public and the home improvement industry, recently conducted an essay contest on "The Star-Spangled Banner: Flag of Freedom." The project was dedicated to the 190th anniversary of the U.S. flag.

Mrs. Barbara Lee Conrad, Baltimore, Md., was selected as the first prize winner. She is a former police department secretary and the wife of a police officer.

Mrs. Billie Wells Keller, Baltimore, Md., was named winner of second place. A secretary and homemaker, she was the first prize winner of the "Why I Like Baltimore, Our Baltimore" essay contest sponsored by Maryland Improvement Contractors Association in 1966.

Mrs. Patricia Kathleen O'Doherty, Baltimore, Md., mother of three sons and two daughters, and grandmother of 30 grandchildren, was named the winner of third place honors.

The contest was conducted by the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association officers and board members. The officers included Paul Caplan, president; Philip Baron, vice president; Aaron Glatt, secretary; and James J. Oliver, treasurer. The board included William H. Klarner, chairman; Milton Bates, Robert O. Downs, Richard W. Goswellen, William Lobe, and Fred Stoddard.

In conjunction with the 190th anniversary of the U.S. flag, marked in 1967, it is fitting to recall that the oldest official American flag known to exist measures only 3 by 6 feet and its colors have long since faded. But it is hanging proudly in its lighted display case in the Maryland State House in Annapolis.

The full story was contained in an Associated Press story published in the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, on June 14, 1967. The text is as follows:

OLDEST OFFICIAL U.S. FLAG HANGS IN STATE HOUSE

ANNAPOLIS.—It's not very big—it measures only 3 by 6 feet—and its colors have long since faded, but hanging proudly in its lighted display case in the Maryland State House is the oldest official American flag known to exist.

It was exactly 190 years ago, on June 14, 1777, when the Continental Congress passed the Flag Act specifying "that the flag of the United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

It was sometime between that date and 1781 that the Flag of Cowpens was patiently stitched from homespun flax with coarse brown thread, its ring of stars appliqued on a blue field.

It first appeared in American history when it was carried into the Revolutionary War Battle of Cowpens, S.C., as the standard of the Maryland 3rd Infantry by a soldier from Baltimore, William Bachelor.

It was soon forgotten, but reappeared 33 years later when, during the War of 1812, the British attacked Baltimore, bombarded Fort McHenry and landed an army at North Point.

This time, the battle flag accompanied members of the 26th Maryland Infantry as they marched to engage the British at North Point. It was carried by William Bachelor's son.

Thus, Maryland's Flag of Cowpens became the battle companion of Maryland's Star-Spangled Banner. But the progress of the two was quite different.

The banner entered American history as a symbol of triumph—and looked the part. It was new; it was huge; and it flew from a giant staff—87 feet high. It was sheer magnificence.

The faded little flag of the Revolution, on the other hand, just slogged patiently up North Point to meet the assault by land, carried in the sweaty hands of the Maryland militiamen.

As far as Defense Department records show, it is the only existing national flag made during the Revolutionary period.

It also is the only flag to be carried in both the Revolution and the War of 1812.

And it has 21 bullet holes to show for it.

The flag contest conducted by Maryland Improvement Contractors Association takes on added importance in view of the recent announcement that a series of 10 flag stamps, to be issued on July 4th, will include the first Stars and Stripes, 1777; and the flag which flew over Fort McHenry, the 15-star, 15-stripe flag which inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star-Spangled Banner."

It is my pleasure to include, for publication, the three inspiring essays written by the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association prize winners. The texts follow:

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER: FLAG OF FREEDOM

(By Barbara Lee Conrad, Baltimore, Md.,
first prize winner)

What is the American flag? Merely a banner to fly on national holidays and mechanically honor before a big game? Or does it have a deeper meaning—one too deep for us to consider in our hectic world?

It has a glorious past, our flag. It recalls to us our founding fathers—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, Adams—who turned the ideas of men into the ideals of a democracy. It was the inspiration of Revolutionary Regiments, so anxious to reveal to the world a united army that they created their standards from a scant recording in the Congressional journal of June 14,

1777: "Resolved: that the flag of the United States be made of thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." It was this flag that emerged victorious from Civil War and saw a young nation rally and grow into the fifty firmly-united states of today. On foreign battlefields it has been the victor—always the victor, never the conqueror.

It is the reality of today—the men in Vietnam who, because it is their duty, fight and die for many who denounce them and for many who are just indifferent to them, but for thousands and thousands of others who realize their dangers and their sacrifices. It symbolizes 200 million imperfect individuals living in an imperfect society, striving so hard for perfection that sometimes they hate themselves and, sometimes, each other. It is the tears of women and the unselfish convictions of men; the delightful laughter of children and the ear-piercing racket of the teenager. It is the latest legate to the fact that generosity and sacrifice are sometimes returned in ingratitude and hatred.

It is the hope of the future—the dreams of youth placed upon a foundation of the tolls of the aged and built toward a better tomorrow. It is the genius of invention; the miracles of modern medicine; a nation reaching for the stars. These things cannot be burned or destroyed. The desecrator shows the greatest amount of disrespect to himself.

It is a strong, determined population devoted to the doctrine of personal liberty. They are Americans, you and I. Fly your flag high. It is the flag of freedom.

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER: FLAG OF FREEDOM

(By Billie Wells Keller, Baltimore, Md.,
second prize winner)

On June 14, 1777, sandwiched in with the minor detail and petty routine of "small matters", the Continental Congress approved the first legally adopted national flag of the new United States, and worded simply, directly, even tersely was her birth certificate: "Resolved, That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

The "Star-Spangled Banner: Flag of Freedom" is now in her 190th year.

She has flown from the masts of old sailing ships, modern freighters and ocean liners; traveled by covered wagon, train and airliner. Always, she has been saluted as the emblem of a free and mighty nation.

She was there at the birth of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution; at the launching of our first peacetime warships—the United States, the Constitution, and the Constellation.

She has been carried through seven memorable conflicts with other nations, but never yet borne into any battle fought for a cause other than liberty.

With all her valiant years and service, the role she played during the British land and naval attack on Baltimore, September 13-14, 1814, gained for her immortality. Inspiration for The Star-Spangled Banner, she is the only flag in the world to be the subject of a national anthem.

In 1928, on the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the flag of the United States, Calvin Coolidge made an appeal to the American people:

"It will be futile merely to show outward respect to our National Emblem if we do not cherish in our hearts an unquenchable love of and devotion to the unseen which it represents."

White for purity, red for valor, blue for justice; a living symbol of those virtues for which our nation stands. How strong in

stature, how firm in respect she has grown across the face of the earth. We can walk in her shadow, tread in her footsteps and feel as big as a giant.

Spirit of her people, she has seen the adoring eyes of the young, looked into the knowing hearts of the old; heard our silent benediction, "Thank God, I am an American."

The Star-Spangled Banner, true to God; to country; to every man who has played a role in helping her fulfill her destiny. Even from infancy she has spoken out proudly and distinctly of our precious inheritance. She seems to say to each and every one of us that Freedom is the root and foundation of our lives, and that we have a responsibility to the past and a responsibility to the future to:

"Fervently reach out with heart and hand to erase hatred, eradicate bigotry; deny not the goodness of God, or worth of man; Maintain the American way of life each day for the dawn of all tomorrows, so that the core of America's character shines ever a testimonial to the world."

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER—FLAG OF FREEDOM—KEEP IT FLYING

(By Patricia Kathleen O'Doherty, Baltimore, Md., third prize winner)

May the hearts of grateful citizens of these United States, be kindled into a glowing flame of love and tenderness, especially we immigrants when we gather in brotherly love, beneath the folds of the Star Spangled Banner. We, who have known the sting of a foreign master's lash, finger its pleats reverently and press our lips to that emblem of Freedom. If Emma Lazarus could write from the core of a thankful heart that beautiful inscription engraved on the base of the Statue of Liberty, then why not we, the privileged ones alive to-day, prove our indebtedness to this Land of Liberty and Fly our Flag on every occasion? Those also born here beneath its Stars and Bars should know like a prayer the history of its symbolic tenor.

Fly that Flag of Freedom with great pride, it never went down in defeat or disgrace. A hastily improvised banner of thirteen red and white stripes and thirteen white stars on the blue upper dexter corner of it, was authorized by the Continental Congress in the Resolution of June fourteenth, 1777, on the admission of Vermont and Kentucky and was raised for the first time over Fort Stanwiz, Rome, New York, August 2, 1777; on the approach of the British force. Valorous and intrepid men, young and old beheld the red bars of that emblem of Freedom dyed a deeper crimson at Valley Forge the winter of 1777, there was very little warmth but there was no flag burning as a pretense of disbelief in the reason or cause for the fight against tyranny. Our Maryland Legislature on December 3rd., 1777, in the Preamble to an Act declared "that in every Free State, allegiance and protection are reciprocal and no man is entitled to the one, who refuses to yield to the other, and every free male 18 years and over should take the oath of Fidelity to the State", and our Emblem was not burned to dust; Maryland had no weaklings or ill livers.

Our Maryland line under command of General Smallwood took quarters at Wilmington and proudly carrying their Banner, marched on to Monmouth where their line, thinned down to 1400 men, held the enemy in check until other reinforcements came forward and victory was theirs at Monmouth. The Marylanders carried that Flag to victory under brave men like Col. Howard, Williams, Greene and others. Through the war of 1812 the Flying Flag "Mid shot and shell", gave to this Nation its National Anthem. Through World Wars one and two, on to Iwo Jima, to Korea, now Viet Nam, the Flag of Freedom, was and is carried proudly.

In God's Name, in Freedom's name, let it fly defiantly in War, blissfully in Peace, but keep it flying. Lower it only when enshrouding the caskets of our Patriot Dead.

Electronics in Transition

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 20 of this year the International Electrical & Electronic Engineers met in New York City and presented their Founders Award to Mr. P. E. Haggerty, president of Texas Instruments, Inc., of Dallas, Tex.

This is a well-deserved honor for one of the outstanding scientists in our Nation and one of the finest men in our land.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith for the benefit of my colleagues the remarks Pat Haggerty made in accepting the award. I believe these comments on our times provide an insight and concern which speak better than I am able to do of the tremendous intellectual capacity of Pat Haggerty. All too often those in scientific endeavors do not take the time or expend the energy to see the full ramifications of their efforts on mankind. Pat Haggerty certainly has more capacity in this area than any other man I have had the opportunity to know.

In his speech, Mr. Haggerty asks of his award and those presented to some of his colleagues:

Are these awards exclamation marks at the end of the middle paragraphs in the composition of our life's work, or are they periods following the summary sentences?

I believe I can speak for all those who know Pat Haggerty well enough to be aware of his great capabilities for even more significant contributions to society. We sincerely hope this award is just a short pause for a time of recognition to encourage his further efforts. America needs more men like Pat Haggerty today.

The address referred to follows:

ELECTRONICS IN TRANSITION

(Address by P. E. Haggerty, on receipt of IEEE Founders Award, March 20, 1968)

This is one of those times in the life of a man when, having been honored by his peers for some of his labors, he must, while accepting the honors with appreciation and humility, yet look at himself and his work against a background of the time in which he lives and the problems of the society of which he is a part. Mixed feelings of pride and humility are especially strong for me tonight, because among so many worthy men being honored tonight by the Institute are two of my associates, Roger Webster and James Biard, newly elected Fellows of the Institute, and especially because, by one of those coincidences of life, you have chosen to bestow that senior award of the Institute, the Medal of Honor, upon another respected friend and associate, Gordon Teal. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, these four threads that you have tied together tonight extend back over two decades to Gordon's inspired work with single crystal germanium and silicon, which, together with the contribution of Morton, Brattain, Bardeen, Shockley and many more of his then associates at the Bell

Telephone Laboratories, must be evaluated as the discovery of a new technological world, the exploration and development of which has brought the four of us and a large proportion of all of you here tonight.

By their very nature, awards such as these must often represent culminations of one kind or another; and among the emotions and satisfactions the Founders Award has stirred in me, particularly in juxtaposition with the award of the Medal of Honor to Gordon Teal, a nagging question insists on intruding itself: Are these awards exclamation marks at the end of middle paragraphs in the composition of our life's work, or are they periods following the summary sentences?

We are engineers and these are engineering awards, and engineering has to do with the creation of useful products and services. Thus, any judgment of where these threads you have pulled together tonight fit into the total future scheme of our profession must begin with an evaluation of the pertinence of that profession to the needs and problems of today.

These are exciting times, but troubled ones! The embattled marines at Khe Sanh know it's a troubled world. The Pueblo is still in North Korea. The communist Chinese shout slogans and explode their A-bombs. There is still a wall in Berlin; and meetings like this here and in the USSR help to keep the drapes making up the Iron Curtain from meeting as tightly as they once did, but the Iron Curtain is still there.

Myriads of new nations find that independence is but a first step, and that the stability and the affluence they seek can be found only at the end of a long and arduous road demanding ability, dedication, diligence, and responsibility from both government and citizen.

International trade is disturbed and there is a gold crisis. Britain devalues the pound and initiates an austerity program; France pursues an at-times agonizing nationalism. The United States faces balance of payments problem and now, after decades as advocates of an increasing free trade, the administration proposes travel bans and overseas investment limitations; and a distressing number of our senators and representatives are recommending quotas and limitations on that trade.

It took an estimated eight million years from man's beginnings to reach a world population of 300 million at the time of Christ. It has taken less than two thousand years to increase that 300 million tenfold and one billion of the three billion have been added in less than forty years. On the basis of present trends we'll have added another billion by 1975 and still another billion for a total of five billion by the early 1980's.

So the world divides into the "have" and "have-not" nations. The "have" nations pay themselves well and enjoy high standards of living. The "have-not" nations have low incomes and poor standards of living.

The United States is a great nation and for most of us Americans the benefits of citizenship are legion. Belatedly, sometimes inadequately, but still genuinely, we are trying to remove the barriers imposed by prejudice so that all of our citizens may have a full share of those benefits. Yet riots have torn our cities; and even without riots we must often be afraid to walk on our streets after dark.

Lake Erie is becoming a Dead Sea; Los Angeles in sunny California rarely sees the sun.

This disturbing look into the world's Pandora's Box leads back to the question with which I began. Are the talents of the electronics industry and, more particularly, the skills of the scientists and engineers who have made it what it is, pertinent to the solution of such problems from among this catalog of ailments as:

1. The problems of war and national defense
2. The problem of the restoration and conservation of our environment
3. The problems of our cities
4. For the "have-not" nations, the problem of transformation into industrial societies
5. For the "have" nations, the problem of sustaining and improving their already high standards of living in the face of the need of the "have-not" nations to industrialize and the relatively much lower wages and salaries they pay themselves while in the process.

Let's see how electronics might be pertinent to problem solutions in some of these areas.

So far as the problems of war and national defense are concerned, the needs are so obvious and the contributions made by electronics so vital that little elaboration is necessary except to observe perhaps that every new military need from strategic missiles to antiballistic missile systems, from helicopters to supersonic aircraft, from reconnaissance to attack, demands more and better electronics.

A principal problem from any heavily populated, reasonably complex society is the orderly development, redistribution, use, and reclamation of its water resources. The hardware and software of electronics allow us to develop atmospheric models, watershed models, sediment models, surface water quality and quantity models—in fact, models of all of the necessary major components to simulate regional water resources. The hardware and software of electronics can further provide the sensors, the memories, the information processes, the data displays and the control mechanisms necessary for the orderly development, the redistribution and use of the water resources. But to apply the tools, somewhere there must be a governmental unit with the comprehension, imagination, authority, and the funds to use them.

Or, take the problem of traffic in any major city. It would now be completely feasible technically to calculate for every artery the conditions for maximum rate of flow of traffic, to identify every vehicle entering that flow of traffic and direct it into arteries not yet at maximum flow and forbid it entry when its addition would simply slow the total flow. There is a saturation point for every system of traffic arteries and electronics can insure that every traffic system carries the maximum amount of traffic of which it is capable under the specified circumstances. Electronics cannot make the artery carry more than that specified maximum. It can help detect and correct breakdowns and make clear what further steps must be taken to increase that maximum flow.

To switch to another problem area, the United States is a high standard of living country. We pay ourselves more for our hours of work than does any other country in the world. The United States must sell to and compete with the rest of the industrialized world. Simultaneously, it must sell to and buy from, the underdeveloped world while assisting the underdeveloped nations in their own strivings toward industrialization. If the United States is to sustain its high standard of living, then its over-all industrial effectiveness must be sufficiently higher than that of any other nation so that when the high wages we pay ourselves for our hours of labor are multiplied by our relative effectiveness, we still come out in total as competitive.

Those of us who are engaged in developing, manufacturing and selling products and services around the world know that in many respects this has become increasingly difficult over the past decade. For example, even though the rate of increase in wages for semiskilled labor in Japan has been increasing faster than it has in the United States,

the absolute difference in cents per hour has increased from about \$1.80 per hour in 1957 to nearly \$2.15 an hour in 1966—or by comparison with Italy, from \$1.72 per hour difference in 1957 to \$2.08 in 1966. Or to make a comparison with another Far Eastern nation, striving with considerable success to move into the modern industrial world, in 1957 Taiwan's semiskilled labor received on an average \$1.98 an hour less than a similar worker here in the United States; in 1966 that difference has increased to nearly \$2.60. While these illustrations are all with respect to semiskilled labor, the relative differences are even greater if unskilled labor is compared and only moderately less if one compares highly skilled labor and costs for professionals and managers.

Obviously, if the United States is to compete with wages and salary differences such as these, the over-all effectiveness of its total industrial machine must be extraordinarily high. To the extent that we cannot meet the challenge, our standard of living must also respond by either slowing down the rate of improvement or actually dropping. The United States has thus far by and large sustained the upward trend of its over-all standard of living by a combination of advanced technology in its products and services and a superior way of organizing to produce those products and services. Both the technology and our way of organizing to produce our goods and services, that is, the way we manage, have been diffused throughout the world since the end of World War II.

Japan is an excellent example of rapid growth into an efficient industrial nation while still paying itself at wage and salary rates appreciably below ours. Inevitably, we are unable to compete in certain areas. The problem we face with respect to the other industrialized nations, they too face in varying degrees with respect to one another, and all of the Western industrial nations face with respect to Japan; but the whole spectrum of industrial development from the United States through Western Europe and Japan and down through the underdeveloped world is such that inevitably every industrialized nation, including Japan, already does and will continue to face similar competition from other nations struggling to evolve an industrial society.

Thus, it seems there must be an inexorable pressure, not just in the United States but on a somewhat descending scale, throughout the entire industrialized world for a constantly improving effectiveness in every segment of each nation's industrial machine. This pressure for improvement in effectiveness must change fundamentally the way in which we design, manufacture, and market our products; but what may be even more significant, it will change the way we organize and manage our businesses.

It is difficult to draw any other conclusion except that the sensors, the logic, the memory, the displays, the controllers of electronics and their associated software are the principal and essential tools which must be applied to increase the effectiveness first of our own industrial machine sufficiently to compensate for our very high wage and salary costs but over a relatively short span of time must be applied extensively and for the same reasons by every industrialized nation.

These are just a few examples, but the solutions to all of these problems have major elements in common. In all of them we need to acquire information through a wide variety of sensors. We need to convert that information into usable signals. We need to separate these useful signals from the inevitable noise which accompanies them. We need to store the raw data accumulated; we need to process the data. We need to interpret it. We need to store the processed and interpreted data. We need to display the interpreted data. We need to cause action in response to the information and create feedback signals to correct the error in the actions taken; and much of the action must be

in real time. Thus, there is a startling coincidence between these needs and what much of electronics is all about today.

Thirty years ago we could have made only the most rudimentary kind of contribution to the solution of these problems. And it is really only in the last ten years, with the advent of solid-state componentry and sophisticated data processing hardware and software, that we can truthfully say we can tackle these difficult problems with tools whose sophistication is commensurate with the difficulty of the problems. It is probably also accurate that almost every tool which is necessary is at least in sight or will be in the 1970's.

Of course, what is really common about these contributions electronics can make to the solutions of some of the world's most pressing problems is, as President Herwald has already emphasized, that in each case man is using electronics to extend his mind, his senses, and to some degree his spirit. The Industrial Revolution that began with the invention of the steam engine by Watt was a revolution that depended upon the extension of man's muscles. The even more significant revolution which is just beginning in these middle decades of the 20th Century is an extension, not just in capability of mind and senses, but in space and time. With electronics man can see, hear, and measure space and time with sensitivity, breadth of response, and precision far beyond that of his unaided senses. With the logic and the memory of electronics, man can expand his mind, not just in size but in speed and apply that logic and memory at a distance. With television and radio, man can already see and be seen, hear and be heard, with few limitations in space and time. With laser holography, in the relatively near future managers and professionals will stay in their offices and laboratories and still participate personally in distant conferences and meetings in three dimensions and in color. Since they can also manipulate and process information with electronic logic and memories at a distance, they may be more effective participants in such a meeting or conference than if they were truly present in person.

So, whether these awards represent exclamation marks or periods as far as Gordon Teal and I are concerned, I have no doubt whatsoever that our profession has barely begun its work, and our industry is still at a relatively early stage in its growth. It may be true that the growth rates of electronics over the next five to ten years will be slowed while we develop and expand the tools on hand and in sight and while we evolve the procedures and institutions, both public and private, to apply them. After that, and for as far into the future as any of us are likely to be interested, I believe that growth in quality, complexity, and size will continue at a rate well beyond that of the Gross National Product. The match between the capabilities the tools of electronics provide and the most pressing needs, not just of the United States but of the entire industrialized world, is too close for it to be otherwise.

Of all this, as an engineer, I am sure. But it is not enough. I hope that as man expands his sight, he will really see; and his hearing, that he will really hear; and his touch, that he will really feel; that as his mind grows, so will his wisdom and his heart. But all this we must add—as men, not engineers.

Positive Approach in Fun City

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of April 17 carried two stories concerning the issue of how to

deal with looters and arsonists in New York City. Criticizing Chicago's Mayor Richard Daley for ordering the use of firearms in combatting vandalism by looters and arsonists, Mayor John Lindsay was quoted as saying:

We happen to think that protection of life, particularly innocent life, is more important than protecting property or anything else. . . . We are not going to turn disorder into chaos through the unprincipled use of armed force. In short, we are not going to shoot children in New York City.

According to the Times the Chicago mayor "had added that he did not want children shot, but suggested that his police use the temporarily disabling chemical spray, Mace, on young looters." Mayor Lindsay also disagreed with the recommendation that Mace should be used on looters.

Despite the dissent of its mayor, New York City has come up with a positive approach to protect the property of its merchants from the firebombers and looters. The merchants in areas of possible danger have been advised to clear their store windows of merchandise at night to reduce the attraction for looters. Perhaps this new "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" policy will prove to be a model for other urban areas in the days and months to come. Or, perhaps more New York merchants will seek greener business pastures—outside of New York City.

I include the article, "Displays Called Lure to Looters," from the New York Times of April 17, 1968, to be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

DISPLAYS CALLED LURE TO LOOTERS—POLICE ADVISE MERCHANTS TO CLEAR WINDOWS AT NIGHT

(By Martin Gansberg)

Merchants in areas of the city that suffered damage through the looting and arson that followed the slaying of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4 are being urged by the police to clear out their window displays when they close for the day.

"This is not an order," a high official in the Police Department said yesterday. "We can't order store owners to do such a thing. But it would be the kind of thing that any sensible police officer would tell any sensible merchant to do."

He explained that the request to merchants to remove window displays at the end of the day would be made by precinct officers who believed this could reduce the attraction for looters, most of whom have been 16 to 19 years of age.

So far, it was reported, requests have been made to owners of stores selling jewelry, liquor or apparel. Most of the looting reported during the six-day period following the assassination of Dr. King was in these types of stores, the police said. They noted that they had made 480 arrests.

SHOPOWNER AGREES

A woman who operates a specialty shop near 158th Street and Broadway in Washington Heights said she had agreed to clear her windows after a policeman had suggested it.

"But please don't use my name in the papers," she asked.

"Six stores in this neighborhood have been looted in the last week," she said, "and we'll do anything to improve protection here. I have some jewelry in one section that is valuable, and I wouldn't want to have it stolen."

William R. Sloane, executive director of the Fifth Avenue Association, said many of his members were not able to clear their windows because "it takes a whole day to dress them up."

He said, however, that some stores featuring apparel that might be attractive to looters have been removing the clothing at night. He cited Blye's, at Fifth Avenue and 46th Street, as an example.

Blye's, which suffered heavy damage last summer after young vandals broke windows and stole display merchandise, has been removing sweaters every night because it has found these particularly appealing to looters.

Another area that has been asked to clear its windows is the jewelry district on 47th Street between Fifth Avenue and the Avenue of the Americas.

"We had a panic meeting," said Michael C. Fina, president of the West 47th Street Jewelers and Merchants Association, "and we decided to do whatever was asked. We've had millions of dollars worth of jewelry in our windows and the police told us frankly that they were worried about it."

An official of a major department store, who asked that his name be withheld, said that merchants had been invited to the Police Academy, 235 East 20th Street, after Macy's, Klein's and Bloomingdale's were hit by Molotov cocktails on March 30.

"We were shown what these bombs look like and told to take several precautions," he said. "The police also advised us to cut down on our window displays at night."

A Harlem liquor merchant, a member of the Uptown Chamber of Commerce, said he had been urged to remove his displays at night.

"I can't do it," he said, "there's too much work. Instead I'm inserting plywood boards between the protective railing and the windows. I hope this will discourage looting."

A Second Golden Age of Greek Comedy

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the military dictatorship in Greece has been in power for 1 year. During this time, it has done little of value in that land. The unhappy fact is that it has embarrassed Greece in the eyes of the world and cast doubt on the integrity of democratic nations and individuals who have excused the coup or kept silent about it.

The Greek junta has provided comic relief at times, with its ban on miniskirts and the like. Their actions have provided fertile soil for the Greek love of anecdote and ridicule. But underneath it all, they realize they are paying the price now and will pay in the future. Economic crisis looms. Even if the junta falls, Greece will suffer the economic consequences of this dictatorship for some time.

A second consequence of the dictatorship which seldom is mentioned is the stifling of creativity. The most creative people, those who had begun to move Greece into a belief that a "second golden age" was possible, are either silenced or in exile. The regime is pulling the public tastes down into a pedestrian mediocrity. The arts are suffering. In the discipline of the film, for example, the most distinguished international artists—actresses Melina Mercouri, Irene Papas, and Director Michael Cacoyannis—are

estranged from their native land. In every discipline, a similar situation exists.

I insert below three new stories which reflect the regime's clownish aspects and their insensitivity to the arts:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1968]
GREEK POSTCARDS TO FLOOD THE UNITED STATES—JUNTA IS SEEKING TO OFFSET EXILES' BOYCOTT DRIVE

ATHENS, April 13.—The year-old revolutionary regime is planning to flood the United States with a million publicity postcards to combat what it calls "an unholy Communist-led defamation campaign."

The campaign is to be the first of a series designed to offset a major effort by expatriates for an economic boycott of Greece until the military regime restores democratic rule.

Greek businesses have been asked by the Trade Minister, George Papadimitrakopoulos, to subscribe to a \$230,000 fund for the drive, sponsored by the Athens Chamber of Commerce.

He wrote in a circular letter: "The unholy defamation campaign launched by international Communist against Greece has already fallen through. Yet the professional myth-makers and slanderers will not give up."

"And, as is known, slander always leaves traces, at least for the naive and the credulous. The lawful defense against this brutal anti-Greek campaign is the duty of all Greeks."

The plan is to mail the cards to a million American companies and individuals, drawing their attention to the fact that Greece, along with Finland, is the only European country exempt from the United States and on foreign investments.

The colored picture postcards will also send greetings and slogans, plus the compliments of subscribing companies.

Each card will cost the subscriber 7 drachmas (about 23 cents), including printing and postage, and there will also be the cost of buying an American mailing list.

SLOGAN IS SUGGESTED

The companies were told they could subscribe to a minimum of 1,000 cards. A suggested slogan was: "1968, the year of Greece. In your thoughts, in your texts, follow the sun in the land of gods. Invest money in the country of the greatest opportunities."

An instruction sheet from the Chamber of Commerce said that the National Bank of Greece would be able to sponsor the sending of 100,000 such cards to American banking concerns while Hellenic Shipyards, owned by Stavros Niarchos, could send 50,000 messages to American maritime concerns.

"The Anti-Greek propaganda abroad, beyond its purely political aspects, presents elements which may seriously affect economic developments," the Chamber said. "It would be impermissible negligence if the Greek productive class left unanswered such an appeal, which might have a serious impact on the country's national economy."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1968]
PREMARITAL TESTS ORDERED IN GREECE

ATHENS.—The army-backed Government, which seized power a year ago, is trying to improve the health of future Greek generations with compulsory methods.

A new law requires all couples planning to wed to obtain a premarital medical certificate. Social Welfare minister Efstratios Poulantzas said the premarital medical examination was aimed at protecting the health of future generations as well as of the present society.

About 75,000 Greeks take marriage vows each year. Men and women suffering from various ailments or hereditary illnesses now are unable to marry.

Among prohibitive illnesses mentioned in the law are syphilis, tuberculosis, cancer, in-

sanity, heart ailments, alcoholism, leprosy, epilepsy and hemophilia.

Statistics show these illnesses are the cause of about a third of Greece's 68,000 deaths each year, with heart ailments and cancer accounting for about 10,000 deaths apiece.

The certificates are delivered by any qualified doctor chosen by the persons planning to marry.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1968]
GREECE ORDERS CURB ON THE SALE OF MELINA MERCOURI'S RECORDINGS

(By Alvin Shuster)

ATHENS, April 19.—The army-backed regime has decided that Greeks should stop listening to records of one of the regime's most vocal critics abroad, Melina Mercouri, the actress and singer.

It also announced an amnesty to another group of prisoners, but there was no word on how many were involved.

Gen. Odysseus Anghelis, chief of the defense staff, issued a directive to prevent the sale, purchase or lending of any records or tapes containing the voice of Miss Mercouri. She is now in London preparing to mark the junta's first anniversary by leading a protest demonstration Sunday in Trafalgar Square.

Previously the regime had banned the music of Mikis Theodorakis, an acknowledged Communist, after having put him in prison last August on charge of subversion. He was released in January, and the prohibition on his music, including the score of "Zorba the Greek," was reported to have been lifted. Some here say that they have heard them played recently.

The order regarding Miss Mercouri was sent to the Athens newspapers, which are under Government censorship, but it was understood that they were later told not to publish it.

DOUBLE CELEBRATION

The amnesty was expected to be part of a series of announcements from the Government this weekend to celebrate not only its rise to power but the Orthodox Easter as well.

According to a brief announcement, the amnesty applies to those peoples charged with offenses punishable with terms up to a year in prison as well as those already convicted and sentenced to terms of up to six months. Those involved in irregularities in foreign exchange are exempt from the amnesty.

In another action, a second former Premier, Panayotis Canellopoulos, urged the United States to cease any support of the army-backed regime. The appeal from Mr. Canellopoulos, the 64-year-old rightist leader of the National Radical Union, who is under house arrest, came during a talk with a group of British members of Parliament here on a visit, which had been authorized by the junta.

DETAINED ON MONDAY

Mr. Canellopoulos was placed under house arrest last Monday as was George Papandreou, the 80-year-old former Premier and leader of the Center Union.

The British visitors said that the former Premier had told them that "Britain and the United States would cease to be symbols of liberty if they supported the colonels" of the army-backed regime.

According to the Britons, Mr. Canellopoulos said he did not intend to issue a detailed statement to follow the bitter denunciation of the regime made by Mr. Papandreou in a statement that reached foreign correspondents earlier this week.

Like Mr. Papandreou, he was said to have expressed the view that the junta colonels had misled the Greek people when they contended that they had had to assume power to avoid a Communist take-over in Greece.

Our National Crime Crisis

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, crime in our Nation, and especially in our cities, is rising with a terrible rate of increase. It is, without doubt, our most crucial domestic problem, our Nation's shame, and a disgrace to this great country.

I have devoted most of my April newsletter to a discussion of this problem and the responsibilities of every individual in bringing about a solution to the crime crisis. I herewith present the newsletter for my congressional colleagues:

CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT REPORTS,
APRIL 1968

RIOTS SCAR NATION'S CITIES

The death of Dr. Martin Luther King set off scores of violent disturbances in the cities of this nation early this month. Few areas of the country were immune, as the looting and burning spread from the deep South to Portland, Oregon.

Violence and lawlessness are tragic directions for the civil rights movement to take. They are doubly tragic, since the majority of the damage is wreaked upon the Negro himself at the same time the riot alienates much of the white community from his cause.

Looting, arson, murder can never be condoned. This nation was established on the basis of law and order. When that law is broken and that order destroyed the basis for individual freedom is undermined—the very freedom that is being sought through the civil rights movement.

WYATT VISITS WASHINGTON RIOT AREAS

In order to get a first-hand appraisal of the situation I spent a full day with two Washington, D.C. police detectives touring the riot-torn areas of that city. The devastation and destruction reminded me of some of the bombed cities during the Second World War. This comparison was all the more obvious because of the presence of U.S. Army and Marine troops in the troubled areas.

TROOPS REQUIRED TO RESTORE ORDER

The armed forces were brought into Washington, D.C., to guard the Capitol and its grounds during the violence. It is a sad situation when the armed might of our military is needed to keep the peace in this country.

RIOTING, CRIME OF ALL KINDS THE MAJOR DOMESTIC PROBLEM

The rate of crime in our nation in the past ten years has soared. Exclusive of the rioting and looting, crime in our streets presents the major domestic problem of our day. The looting, arson, and murder of the recent race riots shows this crime problem even more immediately in need of urgent solution.

Burglaries, larcenies and auto thefts alone accounted for over \$600 million in unrecovered losses in 1966. In many of our cities it is unsafe for people to walk the streets after dark. Policemen must walk in two and threes or with police dogs, simply for their own protection. Organized crime is flourishing in light of recent Supreme Court opinions which allow for legal loopholes whereby mobsters may avoid punishment.

OREGON HAS HIGH CRIME RATE

Even Oregon is not immune to the wave of crime and lawlessness that is sweeping our land. According to a 1967 study, said to say, our state ranks among the top 16 nationally

in the number of crimes committed annually per capita.

Though we have been lucky to have escaped much of the racial violence of recent weeks and months, the potential for disturbance is there. Unrest last summer, and again early this month indicate that there may be problems even in Portland.

CRIME PREVENTION AN INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

The growing incidence of crime, including rioting, burning and looting, can be traced to the same root—the increasing tendency in recent years for individuals to abrogate their basic duty as citizens of this country—the duty to uphold the law and to respect it as the basis for our freedoms.

REBIRTH OF RESPECT FOR LAW AND RESPONSIBILITY NEEDED

Every individual in this nation must experience a rebirth of respect for our laws and law enforcement officials. We each must assume part of the responsibility for keeping and preserving the peace, and for combating crime.

We cannot expect our police forces to control crime when we deny them our support and cooperation. We cannot eliminate looting and rioting if we join the rioters or silently look on with passive assent.

Congress is presently working on a measure which will aid in police training and in local law enforcement. I have given my wholehearted support to this measure as it passed the House. But this alone is not enough. Our police need help, our help. If every one of us makes it his personal duty to go out of his way to respect our laws and to cooperate in their enforcement, only then can we begin to stem the tide of crime.

MEETING HONORS PAST HOUSE MINORITY LEADER

A luncheon meeting honoring retiring Congressman and past Minority Leader Charles Halleck of Indiana was held last month by Beta Theta Pi fraternity. I attended this meeting along with several other Members of Congress, including Congressmen Halleck; Al Ullman, Oregon; Charles Teague, California; John Rhodes, Arizona; Wayne Aspinall, Colorado; and Senator Mark Hatfield, Oregon.

BILL TO FREE DRUG DMSO INTRODUCED

On the ninth of April I introduced a bill in the House which would take jurisdiction over all new drug applications from the Food and Drug Administration and place it in the hands of the National Academy of Sciences. I believe this measure would break the logjam of pressures which have tied the release of DMSO for full clinical testing in FDA red tape. The bill will now be considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Cosponsoring this bill with me in the House are Congressmen John Dellenback (Ore.), Al Ullman (Ore.), Donald Lukens (Ohio), Henry Schadeberg (Wis.) and Congresswomen Edith Green (Ore.) and Catherine May (Wash.). A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senators Wayne Morse and Mark Hatfield of Oregon.

Senator H. F. Byrd, Jr., Praised

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, Virginia's senior Senator, the Honorable H. F. BYRD, JR., quite worthily continues to grow in stature throughout the Nation. During the years that he has been in Congress,

he has manifested the same intense interest in fiscal responsibility and other matters which marked the service of his distinguished late father, one of the dominant figures of the U.S. Senate for more than three decades.

I am glad to note the newspapers and others recognize the astute qualities of our distinguished senior Senator and that the newspapers are calling the attention of their readers to the same, especially his legislative wisdom and political sagacity. During the last month or so, several have made reference to the outstanding work of the Senator, one of them describing him as "one of the foremost thinkers in Congress." Their comments have been so complimentary and, in my opinion, so well merited that I should like to have the same included as a part of the RECORD. They are as follows:

[From the Chicago, Ill., Tribune, Apr. 2, 1968]

With the President's announced abdication, the burden of fixing the nation's course will inevitably devolve upon Congress. We are encouraged to believe that there are some able men of good sense in that body, among whom we would mention such senators as Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Mundt of South Dakota, and Mr. Lausche of Ohio. We hope they will acquire themselves well in the test to come.

[From the Fremont, Ohio, News-Messenger, Mar. 6, 1968]

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., D-Va., a newspaper publisher, says military restrictions are justified on news of damage inflicted by the enemy on fixed targets in Vietnam.

Byrd said in a Senate speech that news media should show greater restraint and said some newsmen have "gone far beyond the call of duty" in reporting troop morale, strengths and weaknesses of American positions and probability of enemy success in overrunning outposts.

And Sen. Byrd will find no one here to contradict his beliefs.

[From the Miami, Fla., Herald, Mar. 5, 1968]

Father and son for 35 years the senatorial Byrds of Virginia have stood watch over the public till. Thus we have Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. warning that the 1969 fiscal year budget not only calls for \$16 billion more in new appropriations than Congress approved for last year, but far exceeds the revenue of the proposed Johnson tax surcharge.

At 10 percent, the tax nobody wants would bring in \$12.9 billion. The deficit gap thus is sizable.

Ten billion dollars of the \$16 billion increase, notes Sen. Byrd, is for expanded non-defense spending. Among other things it would provide funds to hire 45,600 additional civilian employees.

If the Byrd guard detail has not been particularly effective at least it has been informative. One day an aroused electorate will have had enough of the fiscal nonsense which it has been fed for a generation and more.

[From the Pontiac, Mich., Press, Mar. 18, 1968]

On page one today, The Press prints a statement by Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., D-Va. Sen. Byrd is a long-time friend and I evaluate the man first hand. I commend his remarks to you most highly.

He is one of the most forthright thinkers in Congress. Sen. Byrd is a Democrat but he's an American first and places his duty to his country far ahead of everything else. No one anywhere has any strings on him. He has no "entangling alliances."

[From the Elyria, Ohio, Chronicle-Telegram, Mar. 16, 1968]

"No one has yet invented a way to finance government without cost to the taxpayer. There are only ways of putting off the day of reckoning."

That fact of economic life is pointed out again by Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., (D-Va.) in an article in *Spotlight*, a publication of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

The article was written before the gold crisis developments of the last few days, but it is especially timely in view of that crisis.

"No government," Sen. Byrd wrote, "can play a constructive role in the lives of its citizens except on the basis of economic strength. It is not that dollars are more important than people and their needs. It is simply that without a sound dollar, all programs and projects financed by the government will be undermined."

Sen. Byrd's warning deserves thoughtful consideration by all Americans. The day of reckoning may be nearer than most Americans have believed.

[From the Staunton, Va., Leader, Apr. 4, 1968]

The Senate would have won considerable applause had it also written into its excise tax bill the proposal of Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., D-Va., to ban loans to countries trading with the Communist enemy in Vietnam.

Andreas Papandreou Meets the Press

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 the guest on the National Broadcasting Co.'s "Meet the Press" was Andreas Papandreou, chairman of the Panhellenic Liberation Movement and former Greek Cabinet member, Mr. Papandreou, who was freed in December after 8 months' imprisonment, spoke forcefully for restoration of liberties in Greece and against the oppressive military rulers who have governed for more than a year. It is particularly fitting that Mr. Papandreou's comments be reprinted at this time, because yesterday, April 21, was the anniversary of the coup that plunged Greece into darkness.

The "Meet the Press" interviewers were Robert Novak, of the Chicago Sun-Times, Philip L. Geyelin, of the Washington Post, and James Robinson and Lawrence E. Spivak, of NBC. Edwin Newman of NBC was the moderator. The full text of the interview follows:

Mr. NEWMAN. Our guest today on "Meet the Press" is Andreas Papandreou, the exiled Greek political leader who is coordinating the Greek resistance movement. Mr. Papandreou was a member of the Greek Cabinet and Parliament, and he served as chief aide to his father, George Papandreou when he was Prime Minister.

A former naturalized American, Mr. Papandreou was an economics professor at the University of California before he returned to Greece in 1963 to enter politics.

He was charged with high treason under the government of King Constantine and later arrested by the military junta. He was recently released from prison and has just arrived in this country on a visit.

We will have the first questions now from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, in your speech before the ADA last night, you said, "I must add that the U. S. Embassy in Athens gave strong moral support to the King and the Greek establishment in their violation of the democratic processes in Greece, thus paving the way for the military coup of April 21, 1967."

Are you charging the United States with responsibility for the coup?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. The United States Embassy I charge with historic responsibility, not necessarily involvement in the coup itself. Actually coups don't occur accidentally. An atmosphere has to precede a coup, and the U.S. Embassy, I think, participated in creating the atmosphere that led to the coup, Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. You went further. The Washington Post quotes you as saying that the "present Prime Minister of Greece, Mr. Papadopoulos, is probably the first CIA agent who has managed to become a Prime Minister."

Are you saying that the United States helped put him in power?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. That is a fact, what I said in Oslo. Namely, Mr. Papadopoulos was the key coordinator of the Natsinais KYP, the KYP leader in Greece. KYP is the CIA of Greece, the Greek CIA. Papadopoulos was the contact man with the American CIA.

And I add that the American CIA finances the Greek CIA directly, not via the Greek Government, as Mr. Sulzberger himself, has disclosed in an editorial in *The New York Times*.

Mr. SPIVAK. Are you saying that the United States could have prevented the coup?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. The United States might not have been in a position to prevent the coup, but the United States could surely have overthrown the junta, had it wished.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you say now that the United States ought to help overthrow the dictatorship?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. No less than that, Mr. Spivak. I would, however, qualify by saying surely it should not assist the junta, and the recent exhibitions of friendship, and the U.S.S. Roosevelt, the recent statements of Admiral Horatio Rivero in favor of the junta in Greece surely shocked the democratic forces of Greece that are struggling for a free country, for a country that can take its place among the western nations.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, when you look back to the period when you and your father ran the government, do you find you too may have been to blame for the coup to some degree?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Mr. Spivak, no one is ever free, totally, of some historic responsibility. No one. And it is not for me to judge whether I am or not. It is for others to judge.

Mr. GEYELIN. Mr. Papandreou, I understood you to say that you thought we should have moved in and thrown the junta out in the first instance. How do you do that?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. This is more complicated than that, Mr. Geyelin. If the United States did not lend its moral and material support to the government of the junta, the junta would collapse of its own weight, for it has no strength among the Greek people, and it has no strength in fact among the Greek armed services.

Mr. GEYELIN. Was there no danger of a civil war at that time?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Of course not. The junta has charged that the Communists had arms with which they would threaten to overthrow the country. In the ten months of their government they have not been able to discover one single cache of arms. And, after all, the Democratic Center forces were overwhelmingly in the majority in Greece.

Mr. GEYELIN. Is it your view now that the Communists are possibly getting stronger, although you apparently believe there was no threat at the time of the coup? Do you think the junta is creating a threat?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I should think that as time goes on it is quite likely that the more extremist forces in the country will become dominant.

Mr. GEYELIN. All you would have us do now, as I understand it, is what? Withdraw recognition from this government or withdraw all aid? What would you have us do, specifically?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Let me put it this way: Recognition is a formal thing. Sometimes one recognizes even governments it doesn't like. First of all: to stop the display of enthusiasm, love and affection for the government; second: to stop shipping arms to the junta with which they subjugate the Greek people. After all, what are the Greek people to say when the alliance which they joined to protect their freedoms arms this mafia, these few officers, to keep the country in bondage.

Mr. NOVAK. Following up Mr. Geyelin's question about extremist elements in the resistance, Mr. Papandreou, the government-controlled Greek newspapers are now contending that your call for a united liberation front is in effect an invitation for the Communists to cooperate with you, is that correct?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Mr. Novak, the Panhellenic Liberation Movement, which I have the honor to lead today, calls upon all Greeks, not upon parties, not upon party platforms, to join in the effort to overthrow the junta and establish on a permanent and solid basis a democratic process, democratic institutions. Those Greeks who wish to offer time, effort and their life in the effort to establish democracy in Greece—which, after all, is the key principle of the Western World—those Greeks are all welcome. None excluded.

Mr. NOVAK. Even if they are Communists? Mr. PAPANDREOU. I will not look at the files of an individual. Any individual who wishes to offer his services for democracy may offer his services. We do not form a front among parties. We merely call upon the Greeks to join the effort to one single objective: overthrow the junta and establish a democratic government where the Greek people freely, with judicial protection, may express their views and run their own country.

Mr. NOVAK. As far as not forming a front among parties is concerned, as I understand it, the leader of the Greek Communist Party, the KKE, speaking from Rumania, had endorsed your purposes.

Do you rebuff that endorsement or do you refuse to in any way collaborate with him?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. My position, Mr. Novak, I have made very clear. The Panhellenic Liberation Movement is a coordination of resistance movements. It is not a collaboration among parties.

Mr. NOVAK. Going back, Mr. Papandreou, in April, at the time of the coup, some of the colonels claimed that if you had—if the elections had taken place and the Center Union Party had won, you would have invited Communists into the government in a coalition popular front. Was that charge correct or not?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Mr. Novak, why should it be valid—after all, our party had 53 per cent of the vote in '64. On the basis of objective estimates, we would have had more than 53 per cent of the total national vote in '67. Why would any party invite any other party to collaborate when it can run the country on the basis of its own strength? So the question itself is not a sensible question—not your question, but the question that has been put and which you transmit.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreou, you have made some very serious charges saying that the Central Intelligence Agency of this country is directly supporting the junta leaders,

and you have said you would bring out proof of these charges. When could we see these proofs?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. When did I make the charge that it is supporting? And in what fashion did I make the charge?

Mr. ROBINSON. You said the Prime Minister Papadopoulos was in the pay of the CIA. You said that the Minister of Coordination—

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Not in the pay. What I said was that Mr. Papadopoulos was the contact man between the Greek CIA and the American CIA and that the American CIA financed directly the activities of the Greek CIA, not via the government, a question which as Minister to the Prime Minister I raised—one of the reasons in fact that I have been charged, early, as being anti-American, a charge that is false, [but] I am against interference of the irresponsible agencies in the internal affairs of other countries.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreu, as far as I can see from your country, you have had no support there. The Center Union Party has denounced you, Karamanlis, probably one of the most famous Greek exiles, has not come to your support. The Royal Family has not come to your support. Where is your backing?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Mr. Robinson, the Center Party has never denounced me. One man dared say something under the pressure from the junta, and he has been scratched from books of the party officially in Greece. Mr. Spanoriggas who made this statement is no longer a member of the Center Union. As for Mr. Karamanlis, I don't need Mr. Karamanlis' support. He is the head of a different party. As for the King, he has no business supporting anybody, me included.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreu, when you went to the United States Embassy in Athens a few weeks ago to get a visa—

Mr. PAPANDREOU. No, not to get a visa; I got my visa in Paris.

Mr. ROBINSON. The United States Embassy anyway reported back to this government here that you gave them assurances that you would not indulge in political activities while in this country. Is this true?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Quite to the contrary, there was no discussion about what I would be doing. When asked by Mr. Pattakos, the Deputy Premier of the junta what I would do abroad, I said I would be true to myself; you know my history and you can guess the rest. And my discussion with Mr. Talbot had nothing to do with my own personal plans.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreu, as you know you have been called far left by some and Communist by others. How do you describe your politics?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. My politics can be described in very few words. Politically I am a fanatic democrat. I believe in the Bill of Rights, the freedom of speech, of press, of syndicalist and political organization.

I believe, second, in a judicial system which is independent of the executive and can protect the citizen from police and arbitrary executive intervention.

Socially and economically, I am what you may call a New Dealer. Insofar as foreign policy is concerned, I believe that Greece as a member of the western alliance ought to have a voice in matters that affect its own future. It should not be a satellite, but an ally. And I do want to register my great chagrin, Mr. Spivak, that today this alliance that Greece joined to protect its freedom is supplying the junta with arms. This is unacceptable, Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Would you under any circumstances support a Communist regime in Greece or would you fight it as you are now fighting the junta?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I am against totalitarianism of all forms, Mr. Spivak, and this is something that is in the record. I shall fight for freedom no matter who threatens it.

Mr. GEYELIN. Mr. Papandreu, when you attack the United States government for its policy in Greece, are you talking about Pres-

ident Johnson's policy or the Secretary of State's, or are you suggesting that there are agencies such as CIA that are out of control and beyond the effective discipline of the government?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I have myself been very puzzled to understand the way the political process leads to a policy, a foreign policy. I am aware from my experience in Greece that the various agencies of the U. S. government have often not been in accord and that often the more irresponsible elements make out—the responsible elements being forced to follow a fait accompli.

Mr. GEYELIN. Would you have us now cut off economic assistance of all kinds to the junta at the expense of the people in order to weaken them?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Indeed I would. For the Greek people have to bear one kind of sacrifice or another. One is the economic sacrifice for the short run. But if the junta were to survive because of economic and military support of the West, then the sacrifices would be much greater for they would have to engage in an active resistance effort, very costly, very costly indeed to Greece, Europe and the free world as well.

Mr. GEYELIN. The junta is making a campaign now through a public relations agency in this country to attract private American investment. What is your advice to those potential investors?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Stay out, for when we return to Greece, we shall question all those who decided to help the junta during this period.

Mr. NOVAK. Mr. Papandreu, in your address to the ADA last night, you said that the junta did not even have the support of the Army last April. Do you feel that there is still lack of support in the Army, and that is the basis for a possible counter coup today?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Yes, Mr. Novak, I believe this quite deeply, because the Greek Army today resents the fact that a Mafia, using the intelligence apparatus at its disposal, has taken over control, has sacked over 2,000 NATO-trained officers, and is attempting through intelligence methods and through political commissars in every unit to run the Army. There is no longer an Army in Greece. It is a setup of political cliques. The Army resents this and will have the opportunity itself, we believe, to upset the junta.

Mr. NOVAK. Why didn't the Army then respond to King Constantine's attempted coup in December? In fact, why didn't the people, if they were as anti-junta as you say—why didn't they respond to the King in December?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. It is a monument of mismanagement, Mr. Novak. The Army, itself, had not been alerted. The King, himself, decided suddenly on the date of the coup, in response to Mr. Karamanlis' appeal to the Greek people the 9th of December—I think the King became concerned that Mr. Karamanlis would make the coup and chose to make it very rapidly himself to prevent Karamanlis from carrying through a coup against the junta. It was so badly managed. And, first of all, how would the people know? He didn't even have a radio station. A taped statement from Larissa, a second-rate station, reached some Greeks.

Now, of course, I have to add that the King could have stayed there and fought. He could have. In Macedonia there were military forces ready to fight and win. As for the Greek people, the King is not a symbol they can easily follow after the events of July, 1965, and thereafter.

Mr. NOVAK. Are you suggesting that if Mr. Karamanlis had led the coup, if it had gone as you say it was originally planned, that it might have been successful?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. His record is far superior to that of the King. I think it might have been better.

Mr. NOVAK. One thing I don't quite understand is that in the Nazi occupation in

World War II there were repeated incidents throughout the villages of Greece against the occupation forces, even though it meant death. Why are there no such incidents against the junta if the people are against the junta?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. It is not quite true there is no resistance in Greece, Mr. Novak. Publicity is a little difficult to get. Let's not forget we have 4,000 prisoners today and heavy convictions; we have mass firings of Army officers and civil servants. What do these things suggest? Why the tortures today? One should read the Amnesty International Report, Mr. Novak, to know the extent to which this junta has surpassed the Nazi techniques in psychopathic punishment and torture, things which are not well known abroad, for the public relations firms, including the Litton firm, which has turned out to be nothing else but a public relations firm for the junta, managed to put a cover of secrecy over what happens in Greece.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreu, you were a very prominent personality in Greece. Don't you think it is strange that the junta let you go?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I do indeed. I think it is one of their critical errors. They will regret it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Might they think that you are not particularly dangerous to their—

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I think that this is what they thought, and it is not for me to judge whether I am or not, but I believe they will regret this mistake.

Mr. ROBINSON. Did you give the junta assurances that you would not engage in political activity when you went abroad?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Quite to the contrary. None. Quite to the contrary. I said flatly that I would return to the Greek political life when the people called for me. Quite to the contrary. I have made the opposite statement.

Mr. ROBINSON. These statements you are making abroad, does this not endanger your father?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. It endangers my father, indeed, and possibly myself.

I think that I should mention to you today, Mr. Robinson, that a government newspaper asked that the prosecutor in Greece, the public prosecutor, visit my father and ask him whether he allies himself with me or not. If he allies himself with me, then he has to be charged before a court martial with high treason. If he disowns me, then, of course, this means something for his political—his great political and historic career. This is the kind of people they are, and so far as my personal safety is concerned—you asked earlier about evidence. Well, I have evidence. It is in a safe and it is my security.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreu, just before the coup d'etat last year, you made a speech where you charged that the CIA formulated American policy, and you criticized this policy for trying to isolate the Soviet bloc from making gross errors in Vietnam, in Latin America and with our allies in NATO. Do you still stand on these charges?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I have made—it is not a charge; it is an observation, and it is an observation which I believe objective and which I make with a great deal of sadness, Mr. Robinson, because I have lived and worked and enjoyed my life here for 22 years. I, along with many others who today are Americans—I am no longer one—feel that the foreign policy formation process in this country does not satisfy the rules of democratic government which exist in all other sectors. The checks and balances which are so important in all democratic processes in your country don't work in the case of foreign policy. The Pentagon and CIA and State Department bureaucracy play more of a role than they should. This is my point, and it is a point of critical importance to the survi-

val, not only of your country, but of all the western world, Mr. Robinson.

Mr. NEWMAN. Gentleman, we have about three minutes left. Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, in a recent article you wrote "Above all, Greece insists that its allies cease interfering in its internal political affairs."

Aren't you in effect, by what you are saying here today, interfering in our political affairs?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. No, I think not. We are too small, Mr. Spivak, to interfere in the affairs of big, great, America. However, our own fate is tied up with what America does, and to make a clear plea, Mr. Spivak, to the American people and the American political world to come to the assistance of the democratic forces of Greece is surely not interference in the internal affairs of the United States.

Mr. SPIVAK. Aren't you then asking us though to interfere in the political affairs—

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I am.

Mr. SPIVAK. Where is the logic of that?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. The logic is very simple, Mr. Spivak. When a country is occupied by an enemy force, then we are entitled to ask all peoples to come to our assistance. The Greek people are not sovereign today. If they were sovereign, I would not ask for any interference.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, there have been reports that you have been in touch with King Constantine and that you have been seeking to heal the breach between you. Are those reports true?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. They are not. I have taken no initiative. So far as the breach is concerned, it is irrelevant. In politics personal animosities should play no role.

Mr. SPIVAK. Would you like to see the King back on the throne?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. My personal view, Mr. Spivak, is that the Greek people ought to decide this question. My personal views are quite irrelevant.

Mr. NEWMAN. Two minutes, gentlemen.

Mr. GEYELIN. Mr. Papandreou, I understood you to say that the junta would fall, really, quite easily if we withheld our support, that it has no popularity amongst the people and not even any support in the Army.

What does keep it in power?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. An intelligence apparatus with modern technology. Use the tanks, the bazookas and a very good communications system and spy system and you can go a long way indeed, Mr. Geyelin.

Mr. NOVAK. Mr. Papandreou, you have met with some conservative exiled Greek leaders in Europe. Quite apart from the King, do you think it is possible that these conservatives will cooperate with you in the Liberation council?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I believe that members of the right, of the center and of the left, indeed, in an overwhelming majority, will join forces to overthrow the junta.

Mr. NOVAK. Can you name any members of the right now exiled cooperating with you?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I prefer not to make any mention of names, Mr. Novak.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is charged that in 1938 you were arrested by the Metaxas regime and that you confessed at that time to being a member of the Communist Party, that you were a Trotskyite. Is this true?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. First of all, let's make a distinction. Member of the Communist Party and Trotskyite are not the same thing, Mr. Robinson.

Mr. ROBINSON. You said you were a Trotskyite.

Mr. PAPANDREOU. No, excuse me, Mr. Robinson. I was tortured for many days. My jaw was broken, and at some point when I was punch drunk a piece of paper, already prepared was brought to me and I did sign the paper, whatever it contained—which I do

not remember at this moment, as a matter of fact. This is the story of that incident. I was fighting for democracy then too, against a brutal dictatorship.

Mr. NEWMAN. I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up. Thank you, Mr. Papandreou, for being with us today on "Meet the Press."

Judicial Legislation

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a good part of the uncertainty and confusion that troubles our country is due to judges writing legislation into judicial decisions rather than deciding cases according to precedent as a proper interpretative function. When the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court—often by the narrowest of margins, 5 to 4—add the "hooker" that a contrary view is unconstitutional, the only remedy is by constitutional amendment, which they well know is laborious, time consuming, and unlikely.

Lawyers around the country are becoming increasingly concerned as they seek to advise clients on what courses of action are permissible. One such lawyer is Edward F. Cummertford of the New York bar, who wrote of the "judicial jumble" in the Wall Street Journal of April 22, 1968. Mr. Cummertford's remarks are well taken and I am including them in the RECORD at this point since it is without question of the most fundamental importance that we preserve in America a government of law and not of men:

JUDICIAL JUMBLE: ACTIVISM IS THREAT TO GOVERNMENT OF LAWS AND NOT OF MEN
(By Edward F. Cummertford)

The formal boundary between responsible self-government on the one side and tyranny or anarchy on the other is often termed "the rule of law." Never has that tenuous line been in such danger of obliteration in this country. The rule of law is mocked and attacked, not only by the criminal multitude, but by supposedly responsible elements. Educators and clergy urge us to break laws we do not like, and eager mobs implement their ideas with destructive violence: labor unions violate laws that impinge upon their power and defy court orders, usually with impunity; public officials blandly refuse to enforce the law if their political futures might suffer.

But ironically, it is within the courts themselves that the most serious threat to the rule of law has developed. This comes from a radically new concept of the judicial function called "activism." Judicial activism had its genesis in the Supreme Court about 25 years ago, when some of the Justices began to abandon the age-old principle of *stare decisis* upon which American and English law had been based for centuries. *Stare decisis* meant simply that the principles derived from previous decisions formed a body of controlling law for future decisions. The primary duty of the judge, after the facts of a case were determined, was to find the law applicable to such facts and decide accordingly, regardless of his personal feelings. On this system rested what Americans proudly called "a government of laws and not of men."

Judicial activism means that judges strive for what they deem a "just" result in a case in the light of their own philosophies and socio-economic values, with settled legal

principles being accorded little or no weight. Thus decisions turn more and more upon "who" is the judge than upon "what" is the law. As a result, law is rapidly losing its certainty, stability and continuity. Jurisprudence is becoming the handmaiden of sociology.

This concept of the judicial function reaches its apogee in the doctrine, if that is what it may be called, that even the meaning of the Constitution itself may be changed by the Supreme Court if necessary to achieve "justice" or "equality." While the power of the Court to clarify parts of the Constitution in the first instance cannot be doubted, it is no corollary that the Court may, at its pleasure, keep changing such meaning. The Constitution specifically provides for its own amendment with procedures that completely exclude the Supreme Court.

Some contemporary pseudo-scholars of the law would have us believe that judicial activism is a proper function of courts, entirely consistent with the historical development of law. This is just not true.

WILL OF THE LAW

Let us consider what some of the leading legal minds of the past, men whom proponents of activism claim as philosophical antecedents, have thought about the question. John Marshall, our greatest Chief Justice, declared bluntly in a landmark case: "Judicial power is never exercised for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the judge; always for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the legislature; or in other words, to the will of the law." Charles Evans Hughes, usually ranked second only to Marshall among Chief Justices, is often cited as an authority for the notion that the Supreme Court can change the meaning of the Constitution. This is based on a fragment from an extemporaneous speech in 1907—"the Constitution is what the judges say it is." Mr. Hughes angrily denied having meant any such thing, but the out-of-context words plagued him for the rest of his life and to this day are quoted in textbooks and by professors to justify a concept he abhorred.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, a most influential legal scholar and for 30 years a Supreme Court Justice, maintained that judges should keep their own social and economic views out of decision-making. Benjamin N. Cardozo, Mr. Holmes' disciple and successor on the Court, set forth in painstaking detail the historical and philosophical criteria to be employed by judges in reaching decisions. A liberal like Justice Holmes, he did not believe that the law must be static and never change.

He would have been shocked, however, at decisions that lightly discard decades of settled law on the strength of sociological or economic theories. Justice Cardozo observed: "Lawyers who are unwilling to study the law as it is may discover, as they think, that study is unnecessary; sentiment or benevolence or some vague notion of social welfare becomes the only equipment needed. I hardly need to say that this is not my point of view."

Sir Frederick Pollock, probably the chief authority in modern times on Anglo-American jurisprudence, repeatedly cautioned that judges should follow established precedents and legislative intent, not their personal views, in reaching decisions. Two other important jurist-scholars, Felix Frankfurter and Learned Hand, were extremely critical of judicial activism. Mr. Frankfurter, a protégé of Holmes, went on the Supreme Court a "liberal" in 1939 and retired a "conservative" in 1962—but it was the Court, not Mr. Frankfurter, which had undergone the greater change. Justice Harlan speaks of the idea that all social ills can be cured by courts as having "subtle capacity for serious mischief."

PURE GUESSWORK

The criticism is not confined to Olympian levels. The legal profession finds it increasingly difficult to know just what the "law"

is; hence, attorneys cannot advise clients of the merits of their cases with much assurance. If the outcome of a case depends more on the personal philosophy of the judge than on any other consideration, it is pure guesswork. What was once "Constitutional" suddenly becomes "unconstitutional." Countless Supreme Court decisions are by 5-to-4 votes, often accompanied by several different opinions and bitter, sarcastic dissents. This is the precarious state of law today.

Some activist judges go to great lengths to make sure that they will not be thought of as having unbiased minds. In speeches, articles and letters to editors they frequently take positions on controversial questions. High-ranking judges have even publicly expressed opinions on delicate questions involved in cases awaiting decisions in their own courts—judicial behavior that a generation ago would have been considered reprehensible.

No matter what euphemisms are employed to disguise its effects, careful reflection must lead to only one conclusion: Judicial activism is not merely inconsistent with the rule of law, it is the total negation of the rule of law. If cases are decided on the personal philosophies of judges, then in reality there is no law. If the Constitution has no objective meaning but means only what judges think it ought to mean, it is not a constitution at all but an empty symbol, a sort of national totem. History shows that vague laws, subjectively interpreted and arbitrarily applied, are the tools of tyrants. The equation is as old as the human race—power minus responsibility equals despotism.

Out of the vast crucible of human experience and travail we have constructed a splendid system of law and courts that it is our duty to sustain and improve. The beating heart of that system is the judge. If his mind is a closed one, which recognizes no authority save his own predilections, then all the long shelves filled with lawbooks, the great marble columns and the black robes are but superficial trappings cloaking a travesty.

Judges, like other mortals, need a large measure of humility—the conviction that one human mind can embrace but a tiny particle of all wisdom and knowledge. As one of our most respected living judges, Harold R. Medina, has expressed it so well: "I don't think I have any propensity or desire to mold the law to my own views . . . If I had a question of statutory interpretation and I was convinced the statute meant, and was intended to mean, one thing, I would never decide it meant just the opposite because I thought it was desirable social or economic policy to do so. This twisting and stretching is not for me."

Nor should it be for any judge.

Baltimore's Friendship Airport

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago last Thursday, April 18, Baltimore's Friendship International Airport was like a bride left waiting at the altar—all dressed up and no place to go.

As airports go, Friendship was not exactly a booming enterprise back there in 1958. In fact, she was acquiring the label: "That ghost airport over there in Maryland."

Friendship, to be precise, was not even an international airport from a practical standpoint 10 years ago. It did not originate a single international flight.

Happily all that has changed.

The change began when Pan American World Airways, using a DC-6B, began three-a-week flights from Baltimore to San Juan, P.R. The date was April 18, 1958—10 years ago this past Thursday.

Then and there, Friendship began to grow, to attract other carriers, and to slowly but steadily assume stature among the great international air terminals of the continent.

The story of this growth is impressive:

In 1958, Friendship handled fewer passengers than live in Indianapolis, Ind., a city of 460,000 plus. Last year, 1967, 2½ million passengers passed through Friendship—almost 2½ times as many persons as live in nearby Baltimore.

Today swift jets fly daily from Friendship to London, Paris, and service to Latin America has been expanded.

Pan American, an early partner in Friendship's expanding operations, flew only 3,000 passengers and 100,000 pounds of cargo to and from the airport in that first year, 1958.

Last year, those figures had swollen to 60,000 passengers and 2,600,000 pounds of cargo.

If 10 years ago, Friendship was a bride abandoned, then certainly today she is a happy wife with a dazzling future.

In the supersonic age just ahead, Friendship International will be able to handle the biggest jets on her fine strong runways.

It is distinct pleasure to be able to pay this tribute today to that airport they once called a "ghost."

The ghost is dead, killed by the faith and daring of the people of Baltimore, of Maryland, and the confidence of the airline industry in the success of this splendid facility.

The determination 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker, to make Friendship an international airport was reached by a man who is considered the world's greatest authority on international flight—Mr. Juan T. Trippe, chairman of the Board of Pan American World Airways. We in Maryland are particularly proud of Mr. Trippe's contributions to international flight because the Trippe family has a Maryland history and background dating back to Revolutionary days. It was like a native son returning when Mr. Trippe directed the commencement of Pan American operations out of Friendship 10 years ago.

April 18, 1968, Mr. Speaker, is indeed a day to remember in Baltimore.

Times of Tragedy and Challenge

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this year, the Merchants & Manufacturers Association of Bush Terminal, Inc., one of the truly outstanding organizations in Brooklyn, is celebrating its 52d anniversary.

I was deeply honored to be invited to address the association's spring speaker's

luncheon on April 18—the first woman to be awarded this distinction in the history of the association.

It was an exciting experience for me to be able to exchange views on some of the basic problems confronting our community and country with this distinguished group of businessmen headed by Mr. Ted Hambley, president of the M. & M. Association.

As a Representative in Congress from the Borough of Brooklyn, I shall continue to work for the interests of our people, our community, and our country.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my remarks at the April 18 luncheon follows:

TIMES OF TRAGEDY AND CHALLENGE

I appreciate your kind invitation to join you for this monthly luncheon—and to share with you my views on some of the crucial issues confronting our country and city.

I can begin by pointing out that we do not meet under the most auspicious signs.

The din of clashing arms fills the air. Violence and anger are having their day. Logic, reason, and understanding seem to have lost their appeal.

The fiber of our people—the fabric of our society—the power and the resolve of our nation, are being severely tested both at home and abroad.

These times place heavy demands on all of us.

At home, we have lived with violence—or under its dreadful shadow—for nearly two weeks.

Sparked by the tragic and senseless murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, this violence found its vent in the equally senseless and tragic destruction of human lives and material resources in a score or more of our cities.

At a time when we were beginning to grope our way out of the woods—when our elective governments—on all levels—were beginning to address themselves to long-neglected problems; when our community organizations—ignoring color and religious barriers—were joining together in a common effort to help the disadvantaged and the dispossessed; when individuals—young and old, black and white, rich and poor—were laying the predicate for a viable, cooperating, healthy society—just at that very moment, the assassin's bullet found its mark—violence flared—and lawlessness reigned.

Before long, the reaction began to set in and to undo the progress of the past ten years.

And this Nation hesitated on the verge of taking a giant step into the darkness, and ignorance, and prejudice of the past.

I am not an alarmist by nature.

Neither am I the permissive type who insists that a child, or an adolescent, will be permanently repressed unless you allow him to beat your brains out.

I stand some place in the middle—believing that we must move with the times—having faith in the good will and the intelligence of each succeeding generation—admitting to the wrongs of the past—yet insisting, and insisting with every ounce of our conviction in my bones, that—you cannot have progress without some semblance of order; you cannot have freedom without responsibility; you cannot achieve a better society by destroying society itself—and the law which is the foundation of our freedom.

I sorrowed with the millions who wept at Dr. Martin Luther King's death—I hoped with the millions who shared his dream of a new America—an America reformed without bloodshed and violence; and I bowed my head in shame that my own nation would kill two leaders of our time in a single, brief period of five years.

But I have never condoned—and I shall never attempt to excuse or justify—those who, with mindless anger, tear at the very

sins of our society, attempt to set us against each other, defy the law which is their ultimate personal protection, and try to lead us down the path of violence and hate to the denial of everything that has been worthwhile in our country's past.

And for this reason, I will continue to support—effective anti-crime legislation; federal controls on the indiscriminate proliferation of guns in our cities; better pay, training and equipment for our law-enforcement agencies; improved education, fair-priced housing, consumer protection, and an opportunity to earn a decent living, for the dispossessed, the disadvantaged, and the discriminated-against members of our community who want to make a better world for their children; and I shall support every other program or project which has as its goal the awakening of civic consciousness, and respect for law, among the young, the willful, and the indifferent segments of our society.

For the time has come to set aright many things in this country—and each one of us must play his, or her, part in this historic process.

I also feel that the time has come to take stock of certain developments abroad—to review our national priorities—and to set our course into the wind which will carry our ship of state into a more peaceful, more purposeful and more fruitful decade than the tragedy- and trouble-ridden years of the 1960's.

For we cannot carry—virtually alone—the heavy burdens of free world security.

We cannot continue to overspend abroad, risking the downfall of the dollar and, with it, of the monetary and trading systems of the world on which our own prosperity so heavily depends.

And we cannot continue to pay only slightly more than lip service to the cause of the anguished millions in Central and Latin America—in Africa, the Middle East and the Far East—the millions who, by the sheer weight of their numbers, will ordain the course of progress, of peace, or of growing conflict, in the decade of the 1970's.

During the past three years, our attention and our resources have been committed to the bloody struggle in South Vietnam.

We have lost nearly 20,000 American boys—and some 100 billion dollars of our national treasure—in that conflict.

I do not think that those sacrifices were ill-conceived.

Perhaps because I have lived longer than many of those who are dedicated to getting out of Vietnam at any cost—perhaps because I have eight grandchildren who will some day benefit from our foresight and suffer from our shortsightedness—perhaps because I have lived through two World Wars and some 50 smaller world conflicts—or, perhaps for all of these reasons, I do not believe that you can build peace, and order, and security, by yielding to violence, to lawlessness, and to aggression.

I believe that we must meet these disruptive forces with resounded, controlled strength—or else, we shall reap the whirlwind unleashed by our own cowardice or indifference.

Whether we like it or not, we are a world power of the first rank.

We also live in an age in which the forces of revolution—stimulated, enticed and guided by Communist ideology—are hell-bent on destroying the existing order and plunging the world into mass violence and disorder to be followed by an era of totalitarian, Communist regimes.

We have to stand up to these forces. We must blunt their destructive purpose.

And we must allow change, and revolution, to occur within a framework of at least a modicum of order, freedom and security.

We have been trying to do this in Vietnam.

We have thwarted a Communist take-over of that country—we have given the South Vietnamese the opportunity to establish a viable Government and a sizeable defense force—and we have stood ready, at all times, to talk peace with the aggressors—but not to surrender.

Today the dividends of our policy and of our national resolve are beginning to appear on the horizon, judging from all indications, Hanoi and the Viet Cong are getting ready to negotiate. If this is really the case—as I earnestly hope it is—then peace may soon come to Vietnam, freedom may come to be strengthened, and our forces will be able to return to their home bases.

With the challenge in Vietnam met—and, hopefully, resolved—we can start looking forward to the task of reshaping our priorities and reallocating our resources.

In doing this, we must remember—first, that we have to retain our strong strategic defense force—for without it, there will be no security for free men anywhere; and second, that we have to live up to our commitments to Western Europe and the Middle East, as we did in Vietnam.

The difference here, however, particularly with respect to our commitment to Western Europe, is profound. For while our word must continue to be good—and while we may have to continue to contribute more than 70 per cent of the cost of our common defense by maintaining our strategic nuclear strike force, we should not have to pay for keeping more than half a million troops and dependents in Western Europe.

Surely the need for those expenditures on our part can be reexamined.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have urged strongly that we either substantially reduce the number of our troops and dependents stationed in Western Europe—or secure a much more substantial contribution to their support from our NATO allies.

This, it seems to me, is a course dictated by prudence.

Perhaps we could not have embarked upon that course while the tide seemed to be running against us in Vietnam. Many Europeans seemed ready to construe such a move as a sign of weakness, of our readiness to abandon Europe for the sake of our goals in Vietnam.

We never intended this to be the case. Western Europe remains a vital component of our national security, and of our economic well-being. We are tied to her by heritage and by our common respect for the fundamental principles of the Western Civilization. We shall never abandon our allies on that continent.

But facts are facts. The Western Europeans can pay more of the cost of our common defense. And we should insist that they do so.

We can improve our balance of payments position in other ways, also.

For one, we really ought to reduce the number of Americans assigned to our Embassies and other posts abroad. There are too many of them for the work which they are doing. And they are costing us a sizeable amount of money each year.

We can save that money by reforming our foreign service system—the career system—and reducing our personnel costs abroad.

We can also—at least temporarily—discourage foreign spending by our tourists.

Last year, our tourists spent \$3.6 billion abroad. That was equivalent to the deficit in our balance of payments.

I do not believe that our Government should interfere with our citizen's right to travel abroad. I also feel that legitimate business trips should not be made more difficult or expensive. But it seems to me that, by and large, many of our people could defer foreign travel for a year or two and see the United States instead.

It would help our balance of payments—and it would help their kids learn more about this wonderful land of ours.

Finally, I think that we ought to continue our present restraints on the outflow of investment capital to Western Europe.

It won't hurt us that much, and it can produce double dividends.

We have already invested nearly \$30 billion dollars in Western Europe's productive facilities.

American interests already own some of the best, the most advanced, and sometimes the most profitable, factories of Europe.

The continuation of this policy of rapid acquisition of existing European factories can become a double-edged sword directed against us.

In the short run, it hurts our balance of payments; and in the long run it creates increasing resentment on the continent against the "rich," "acquisitive" Americans.

A measure of restraint is certainly indicated in this field.

There is one area of foreign expenditures in which I feel that we should not retrench but, rather, do more.

This is the area of foreign aid.

I realize that to many people, the term "foreign aid" has a vaguely unpleasant connotation.

It evokes the image of U.S. taxpayer's dollars being used to buy champagne glasses for a hotel in the Caribbean—to dump used and unusable equipment on some unsuspecting recipient in the Near-East—or, simply, to prop the regime of some penny-ante dictator.

There have been such instances in the history of our foreign aid. But do they really represent our foreign aid effort?

I know that they do not. And so do you. Because by comparing the amount of money involved in these exceptional instances with the overall size of our foreign aid effort, we can readily determine that the mistakes and the unwise investments account for only a small fraction of 1 per cent of our aid program.

This record compares favorably with the loss experience of most of our successful business enterprises.

I do not say this to excuse flaws in the administration of foreign aid. I am simply trying to put those flaws in a proper perspective. At the same time, I would like to call your attention to some facts which are seldom played up by our press.

What are these facts?

Fact No. 1 is that foreign aid advances our national interests in both the short-run and in the long-run.

In the short-run, over 95 per cent of the commodity requirements of the Agency for International Development—which administers foreign aid—are procured in the United States.

The proportion of total A.I.D. expenditures made in the United States is somewhat smaller. Nevertheless, in fiscal year 1967, it amounted to 88 per cent of the total.

What do these figures mean?

They mean, first, that foreign aid administered through the Agency for International Development is used to buy between one-and-one-half and two billion dollars' worth of U.S. commodities each year.

They mean, further, that a minimum of 5 billion dollars' worth of American goods are exported annually through programs which are loosely called "foreign aid."

Included in this 5 billion dollar figure are P.L. 480 farm commodities, military equipment, as well as ordinary manufactures and other items.

Because of the peculiarities of our national bookkeeping system, most of these "foreign aid" transactions appear on the deficit side of our balance of payments.

They make a good target for those who argue on behalf of fiscal responsibility and the maintenance of the value of the dollar.

The fact is, however, that commodity and merchandise exports financed under these various programs—but not credited to foreign aid—directly contribute to our trade surplus.

In other words, if we eliminate these so-called "foreign aid" transactions, we will simultaneously reduce our exports, possibly lose our favorable trade balance, and may do little if anything to help our balance of payments.

In the long run, the course of abandoning foreign aid is even less advantageous. For we must remember that foreign aid also—assists our private investments abroad; helps to create expanding markets for American industries; promotes economic development and political stability; and ultimately, by doing all of these things, enhances our own well-being and national security.

I would think, therefore, that our own self-interest would dictate that we do not abandon these undertakings but that we continue to refine, improve, and strengthen them.

In these brief remarks, I have tried to touch upon the three basic problems confronting our country—the crisis in our cities; the war in Vietnam and the requirements of our national security; and, finally, the deficit in our balance of payments.

Each of these problems contains some elements of tragedy—but also a challenge for all of us. For if we—the richest, the strongest, the best educated country of our times—cannot solve these problems, then we better turn in our chips and let someone else have the floor.

Four and a half years ago, in St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, President John F. Kennedy's favorite passage from the Bible was read over his coffin.

I am certain you remember it. It appears in Chapter 3 of the Book of Ecclesiastes, and reads, in part, as follows:

"There is an appointed time for everything, and a time for every affair under the heavens . . .

"A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to tear down, and a time to build . . .

"A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace . . ."

We have been living in a time of rending, of tearing down and killing, of hate and of war.

Let's pray—and determine—that the years ahead will be different: that we will proceed with the tasks of healing and building; of love and of peace.

The decision to do this lies in our hands.

The Private College and the Pursuit of Quality in Education

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Friday past to attend the dedication ceremonies of a new library at Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va. Mary Baldwin is one of a number of privately operated institutions of higher learning in which we take pride in Virginia. Throughout its history, Mary Baldwin has emphasized quality in education. The aspiration to excellence is a tenet there.

The principal speaker at the library dedication was the Hon. Hulett C. Smith, the Governor of West Virginia. His address impressed me as a fine statement of the challenges facing the private col-

leges today, and of means to be considered in assisting them to meet these challenges.

I should like to share with the House key portions of Governor Smith's address, as follows:

We come together today for the dedication of a library, an "educational happening" that will enrich this college and this area.

Almost two centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson submitted to the Virginia legislature a "plan for the diffusion of knowledge." He and other famed founders of our country have believed that when people commit themselves to learning, a revolution of improvement of people begins that will never stop.

It was then, almost two centuries ago, that this type of revolution in education began in this state, in surrounding states, and indeed in this country.

It is continuing today.

We who have worked closely in education, particularly during the last decade, have witnessed, and have been a part of, an incessant change in the higher educational systems—both public and private.

We have been greatly concerned during the immediate past years with plans for "spreading knowledge."

There have been numerous federal programs implemented to aid in the construction of graduate and undergraduate facilities on our campuses.

Financial barriers have been reduced considerably for many students through new loan and scholarship programs.

New community junior colleges have opened up at a rapid rate, to make higher education available in many parts of a state. And in the states of the Southern Regional Education Board, junior colleges have become so numerous that the South has assumed national leadership in this movement.

Racial barriers are being removed, which means that advanced education is no longer limited to the majority or the privileged, but that it is open to everyone. However, our southern colleges are still somewhat less integrated than are those in other areas.

The federal government in the three-year period between 1964-1967 multiplied its commitment to education three times over.

Yet with all these factors—the new programs, the new facilities, more financial aid—the South still is behind national averages in the percentage of college-age persons attending college, in the percentage of advanced degrees awarded, and in many areas leading to full opportunity in education.

While the advancements made in our Southern colleges might well measure up when compared to others in the region, we must begin to evaluate these colleges by the same criteria of excellence which are applied everywhere. We must, as I have said so often in West Virginia, compete with what is good.

Likewise, we are forced to look at how our states are doing on their own to contribute to the advancement of higher education.

While the federal share of spending in the field of education increased from 16 to 24 percent during the last ten years, the state and local governments' share has remained virtually unchanged. While our colleges and universities are bulging with students—more than 5 million are enrolled in colleges today—the gap between income and expenses for higher education is continually increasing.

This revolution of education has, in years past, dealt with quantity—with guaranteeing the greatest number of individuals the fullest opportunity of maximum education. The goal has been to give every young man and woman all the education he can absorb. But, regrettably, we have reached what might be termed a point of diminishing returns in regard to quantity.

We are forced now to direct our sights toward quality.

Efforts to use our resources more wisely to attain quality education might possibly mean the relinquishing of some cherished, old traditions.

It was John F. Kennedy who said, "The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived and dishonest—but the myth—persistent, persuasive and unrealistic."

Therefore, we must dispel old myths, and recognize them for what they are.

In particular, I find this true when viewing the relationship between private and public institutions of higher education.

While our public and private colleges and universities may be considered similar in academic functions and the type of students they serve, they differ considerably in methods of financing.

State governments have clung to the age-old belief that States should not grant financial aid to private or denominational colleges. The main source of income for the private college, endowment and philanthropic giving, has continued to increase—but the purchasing power over the past decade has declined, which inevitably forces the private college to a higher tuition level.

The private colleges and universities are struggling with outstanding competition from state-supported schools, as the states make an all-out effort to develop high quality public colleges and universities, while at the same time, promote low tuitions.

Therefore, many of our fine, small, four-year private or denominational colleges have been forced to merge with a larger state-supported institution because of limited finances or lack of qualified professors.

In the long run, the state is eventually assuming the burden of the expense, while the student is the one slighted.

The absorption of a small college by a larger one often results in a weak university, as opposed to a strong college had the state assumed part of the financial responsibility.

West Virginia has begun already to establish a course of action for assisting its private colleges, along with its public institutions of higher learning, by making funds available to students who could not otherwise attend college.

Just during the past legislative session, a bill was passed which provided for the creation of a state scholarship and loan program, whereby \$25,000 was appropriated to each program. And the bill clearly stated that the loans and scholarships would be made available to students planning to attend either private or public institutions of higher education in West Virginia.

This action, I think, reflects the thinking of the West Virginia legislators and educators toward the value of private colleges and universities, which shows that they have recognized the tremendous benefits received from the private schools by both the state and the students.

I believe the time has come when all states must make some important decisions reflecting their acknowledgment of the need for state aid to the private institutions.

Admittedly, this is a difficult problem, which may involve some legislative action, as it did in West Virginia.

But I am convinced that we are at that point in this educational revolution where it is incumbent on every state to analyze the educational and economic potentials of its private or denominational colleges, and evaluate the value received from subsidizing a private college, as opposed to the investment made.

We must then also consider the quality of knowledge and learning offered by a small, well-equipped, adequately staffed college, as opposed to a large university striving to meet the needs of thousands of students.

This is a question that many states, as has

West Virginia, have decided to answer. And the answer may well indeed benefit the students and the states.

The revolution of learning is in full swing. Knowledge must be shared. The facilities of a New York library should be made available to a college student in Texas.

The teachings of the most skilled physician should be brought to a medical student in Virginia or West Virginia.

A student at a small college should be able to draw instantly on the resources of a large university.

Both the public and private, the small college and large university, are in the position where they must depend to a great extent on highly technical communication methods. Educational television has gained tremendous momentum in our educational systems recently, but nothing compared to what it will in the future. The enlistment of the use of the satellite for communication purposes is not an unrealistic consideration.

For the revolution of education to move equally as fast as the revolution of learning, it becomes necessary to reconstruct our methods for spreading knowledge and our attitudes toward these methods.

Eric Hoffer, the noted longshoreman-philosopher, has written: "If we are to awaken and cultivate the talents dormant in a whole population, we must change our conceptions of what is efficient, useful, practical, and wasteful."

We must look to the future. We must decide whether to continue with tradition, or whether to innovate; whether to direct our sights toward the needs of the private colleges or focus only on the public schools; whether to advance our communication and teaching methods, or cope with what we have.

I say we must show the world just how broad our visions are for education.

Today, at Mary Baldwin, you are taking a step in the right direction.

National Council of Adoptive Parents' Organizations Backs H.R. 19, the Adoption Opportunity Act

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was most gratified recently to learn that the National Council of Adoptive Parents' Organization in its March-April newsletter, National Adoptalk, has expressed its strong support for my bill, H.R. 19, the Adoption Opportunity Act.

The organization, whose motto is "Let Every Child Eligible for Adoption Become Available for Adoption," has urged its members to work for the passage of H.R. 19. As a result, I have been receiving letters of support from adoptive parents throughout the United States.

In addition, the Adoption Opportunity Act has received the endorsement of social welfare agencies, their officials and welfare experts in 34 States and the District of Columbia. It has also received approval of several other national organizations and publications.

This widespread support is truly heartening. It indicates growing awareness that, in justice and in wisdom, adoption expenses should be made tax deductible, as provided by H.R. 19.

Such a tax deduction would provide adoptive parents with tax treatment

comparable to natural parents who may deduct medical expenses. It also would tend to promote adoptions, thereby providing more children with homes and decreasing welfare expenses.

It is my hope that the House Ways and Means Committee, before which H.R. 19 is pending, will soon hold hearings on the proposal.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the recent article from Adoptalk, along with a list of the organizations, agency officials, and other interested parties who have endorsed H.R. 19:

IT IS TIME FOR ACTION

There are six similar Federal bills in the House of Representatives on Ways and Means which would make it possible for the adoptive family to deduct costs of adopting (agency fees, court costs and lawyer's fees) from one's income tax.

They have been bottled up in the Committee and will not come out for a floor vote unless we persuade the members on the Committee of their merits. We urge you to write to the representative from your state. If you write to the others as well it might be very helpful. We should get these Representatives to realize that thru adoption the Community is saved many thousands of dollars on each child. Any child who becomes a ward of the state is very costly to the taxpayers. Let them know that adoptions should be encouraged in every possible way. Of course, this is not our primary reason since we are parents before we are taxpayers—but the Ways and Means Committee deals in money, not necessarily in human joy.

After careful reading and consideration of each of the six bills, N.C.A.P.O. feels that Mr. Zablocki's bill, H.R. 19 is the best because of its wording:

"... (b) *Definition*.—As used in this section, the term 'adoption expenses' means expenses which pertain to the legal adoption of a child by the taxpayer, and which are incurred in accordance with applicable State or Federal laws, including social or adoption agency fees, court costs, attorneys' fees, and other necessary costs and fees in connection with the adoption of the child.

"(c) *Limitations*.—

"(1) *Dollar Limitations*.—The amount of the deduction allowable under this section with respect to any one child shall not exceed \$1,250.

"(2) *Expenses Otherwise Allowable As Deductions*.—No amount which is allowable as a deduction under any other provision of this part shall be allowed as a deduction under this section."

Bills HR 7999 by Helstoski, HR 10620 by Brasco, HR 3353 by Foley are almost identical. However, let's put our efforts on HR 19. If we don't get it out of Committee this year it will be a lost bill and a wasted year. This is an opportunity for us all to work for important legislation. Let's see how much we can accomplish by banding together... our strength will grow only by such efforts. May we count on you?

Write your Representative on the Committee, or if none, to Rep. Zablocki, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

STATE BY STATE LIST OF AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS WHO HAVE ENDORSED H.R. 19

NATIONAL

Committee on Adoption, the American Bar Association, 112 State Street, Albany, New York.

Child Welfare League of America, Headquarters, 44 E. 23rd St., New York, New York.

National Committee for Children and Youth, Headquarters, 1145 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C.

National Council of Adoptive Parents Organizations, Box 543, Teaneck, New Jersey.

ALABAMA

Children's Aid Society of Jefferson County, 3600 8th Avenue South, Birmingham, Alabama.

ALASKA

State of Alaska, Department of Health and Welfare, Alaska Office Building, Juneau, Alaska 99801.

CALIFORNIA

California Assn. of Adoption Agencies, 3161 Plymouth Road, Lafayette, California.

Family and Children Division, Department of Social Welfare, State of California, P.O. Box 8074, Sacramento, California 95818

Board of Directors, Children's Home Society of Calif., 3100 West Adams Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90018

COLORADO

Jewish Family and Children's Service of Denver, 1375 Delaware Street #501, Denver, Colorado 80204

CONNECTICUT

Jewish Social Service of Hartford, 50 Gillett Street, Hartford, Connecticut.

C. Rollin Zane, Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut, Inc., 1680 Albany Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut.

DELAWARE

Board of Directors, Jewish Family Service of Delaware, % Atty. Jacob Balick, 1211 King Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Miss Elizabeth S. Townsend, Chairman, Inter-Agency Committee on Adoption, 1310 Delaware Avenue, Wilmington, Delaware.

FLORIDA

Department of Public Welfare, 227 Park Street, P.O. Box 2050, Jacksonville, Florida.

Executive Committee, The Children's Home Society of Florida, P.O. Box 10097, Jacksonville, Florida 32207

Mr. Wesley W. Jenkins, 928 Lakeview Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

GEORGIA

Children's Center of Metropolitan Atlanta, Inc., 44 Eleventh Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309

ILLINOIS

Bernice Erwin, Lake Bluff Children's Home, 200 Scranton Avenue, Lake Bluff, Illinois.

Board of Directors and Staff, The Children's Bureau of Indianapolis, 615 North Alabama Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

INDIANA

The Children's Bureau of Indianapolis, 312 English Foundation Building, 615 North Alabama Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

IOWA

Miss Katharine B. Wheeler, Supervisor of Adoption, Iowa Children's Home Society, 1101 Walnut, Des Moines, Iowa 50309

MAINE

Child and Family Services, 187 Middle Street, Portland, Maine.

MARYLAND

State Department of Public Welfare of Maryland, State Office Building, 301 West Preston Street, Baltimore, Maryland. 21201

Mr. Clark L. Mock, Executive Director, Family and Children's Society, 204 West Lanvale Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

Miss M. Beatrice Pryor, Director, Wicomico County Welfare Board, Salisbury, Maryland.

Mrs. Esther Lazarus, Director, Department of Public Welfare, 1600 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland.

Rev. J. Francis Stafford, Associate Director, Catholic Center, Archdiocese of Baltimore, 320 Cathedral Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

MASSACHUSETTS

The Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Office of the Dean, Boston College College Law School, Brighton, Massachusetts 02135

Mr. Joseph W. Granata, Executive Dir., Child and Family Service of Springfield, 184 Mill Road, Springfield, Massachusetts 01108

Robert I. Beers, The New England Home for Little Wanderers, 161 South Huntington Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02130

Children's Aid and Family Society of Haverhill, 54 Merrimack Street, Haverhill, Massachusetts.

Mr. Robert M. Myers, Ex. Secretary, Children's Aid and Family Services, 42 Gothic Street, Northampton, Mass. 01060

MICHIGAN

Mr. Renald J. Nagelkirk, Ex. Director, D. A. Blodgett Home for Children, 805 Leonard Street, N.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503

Samuel Lerner, Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service, 10801 Curtis, Detroit, Michigan 48221

Mr. Leonard R. Jagels, Ex. Secretary, Catholic Social Services of Oakland County, 53 Franklin Boulevard, Pontiac, Michigan 48053

Michigan Children's Aid Society, 35427 Grand River, Farmington, Michigan.

Catholic Social Service of Upper Michigan, 400 Commercial Bank Building, Iron Mountain, Michigan.

MINNESOTA

Mr. Charles B. Olds, Children's Home Society of Minnesota, 2230 Como Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Mr. Callman Rawley, Ex. Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis, 404 South 8 Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota. 55405.

Mr. Llewellyn H. Linde, Consultant, Private Child-caring Agencies, Standards and Licensing Division, Department of Public Welfare, St. Paul, Minnesota. 55101.

Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota, 2414 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404.

MISSOURI

Department of Children, Staff Catholic Charities of St. Louis, 4140 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri.

MONTANA

Miss Mary M. Wagner, State of Montana, Department of Public Welfare, P.O. Box 1723, Helena, Montana.

NEW JERSEY

Mr. G. Thomas Riti, Chief, Bureau of Children's Services, New Jersey Dept. of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, New Jersey 08625.

Miss Eugenia B. Stogdale, Ex. Sec., The Family and Children's Society, 60 South Fullerton Avenue, Montclair, New Jersey 07042.

Miss Barbara W. Smith, Ex. Director, Children's Aid and Adoption Society of New Jersey, 142 South Munn Avenue, East Orange, New Jersey 07018.

Mother's Auxiliary of Children's Aid and Adoption Society of New Jersey, Passaic County, New Jersey.

NEW YORK

Children's Aid and Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 330 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14202.

Adoption Service of Westchester, Inc., 19 Greenridge Avenue, White Plains, New York.

Mr. Perry J. Gangloff, The Family and Children's Society of Broome County, Inc., 32 Henry Street, Binghamton, New York.

Mr. Edmund G. Burbank, Ex. Director, Sheltering Arms Children's Service, 122 East 29th Street, New York, New York.

Mr. Lionel W. Lane, Executive Director, Child and Family Service of Syracuse and Onondaga County, 728 James Street, Syracuse, New York.

Adoption Staff of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, 112 State Street, Albany, New York.

NEVADA

Quenten L. Emery, State Welfare Administrator, Nevada Department of Health and Welfare, 515 East Musser Street, Carson City, Nevada.

NORTH CAROLINA

Division of Child Welfare, State Board of Public Welfare, P.O. Box, 2599, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Miss Harriet L. Tynes, Executive Dir., The Children's Home Society of North Carolina, P.O. Box 6587, 740 Chestnut Street, Greensboro, North Carolina 27405

NORTH DAKOTA

Lutheran Welfare Society of North Dakota, 1325 Eleventh Street South, Box 389, Fargo, North Dakota.

OHIO

Mr. John Kelleher, Ex. Secretary, the Catholic Service League of Akron, Ohio, 138 Fir Hill, Akron, Ohio 44304

Mr. Konrad Reinsner, Ex. Director, Family and Children's Service Assn., 184 Salem Avenue, Dayton, Ohio.

Miss Thelma K. Flower, Ex. Director, Family and Children's Service Society, 90 N. Prospect Street, Okron, Ohio 44304

OREGON

Mr. Stuart R. Stimmel, the Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon, 2301 N.W. Glisan Street, Portland, Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA

Miss Roberta G. Andrews, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, 311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107

Rollo A. Barnes, Executive Director, Family and Children's Service of Lancaster County, 630 Janet Avenue, Lancaster, Pa. 17601

RHODE ISLAND

Child Welfare Services, Department of Social Welfare, State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, 610 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Providence, R.I. 02908

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lutheran Social Services, 600 West 12 Street, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57104

TENNESSEE

Roy S. Nicks, Commissioner, State of Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, State Office Building, Nashville, Tennessee.

Mr. William L. Galbraith, Ex. Director, Child and Family Services, 114 Dameron Avenue, Knoxville, Tennessee 37917

TEXAS

Lt. Col. Rachel Sparks, Director, The Volunteers of America, 518 Dandiger Building, Fort Worth, Texas.

Mrs. Ruby Lee Plester, Ex. Director, The Edna Gladney Home, 2110 Hemphill, Fort Worth, Texas.

UTAH

Mrs. Josephine S. Patterson, Director, Relief Society General Board Assn., 18 East North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Mr. Rex R. Ashdown, The Children's Aid Society of Utah, 209 Howell Building, Ogden, Utah.

VIRGINIA

Executive Committee, Children's Home Society of Virginia, 322 South Third Street, Richmond, Virginia 23204.

Executive Committee, Children's Home Society of Virginia, P.O. Box 366, Arlington, Virginia 54305.

WASHINGTON

Board of Trustees, Children's Home Society of Washington, 3300 Northeast 65 Street, Seattle, Washington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. Alice R. Smith, Chief, Child Welfare Division, 1291 Taylor Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Miss Jean Grigg, Lutheran Inner Mission

Society, 2635 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Mr. George M. Pikser, Executive Director, Jewish Social Service Agency and Jewish Foster Home, 1131 Spring Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.

WISCONSIN

Lowell A. Grotteit, Madison Area Office, Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, 704 E. Gorham Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

Mr. Robert G. Hintz, Casework Super., Catholic Welfare Bureau, 25 South Hancock Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

Mr. Gregory Speltz, A.A., Catholic Social Services, P.O. Box 597, La Crosse, Wisconsin 54602.

Department of Public Welfare, The State of Wisconsin, Division of Children and Youth, 1 West Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin 52702.

Pastor Mentor Kujath, Assoc. Dir. Public Relations, Lutheran Children's Friend Society, 8138 Harwood Avenue, Wauwatosa, Wisconsin 53213

The Rev. Benjamin A. Gjenwick, Ex. Dir., Lutheran Welfare Services, 3126 West Highland Boulevard, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208.

Catholic Social Services of The Archdiocese of Milwaukee, 207 E. Michigan Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202.

Mr. William Buchholz, 110 South Main Street, Edgerton, Wisconsin 53534. (Member of the Board, Lutheran Welfare Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan.)

Dr. C. David Hollister, School of Social Welfare, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The Rev. Canon G. R. Olson, President, Board of Directors, Children's Service Society of Wisconsin.

Green Bay Branch, Children's Service Society of Wisconsin.

Green Bay District Office, Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

The "Dead" Radio Industry

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in their April 15, 1968, issue, *Forbes* presents an illuminating article concerning the growing trafficking in broadcast licenses. Entitled, "A Loss Can Be a Profit," the presentation effectively deals with the myths surrounding the loss pattern of broadcasters.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the article to which I refer follows:

A LOSS CAN BE A PROFIT

Why should anyone want to get into the radio business?

In 1966, the most recent year for which the Federal Communications Commission has statistics, 28% of the 3,912 radio stations in the U.S. reported losses; and the four major radio networks together went into the red for a total of \$1.7 million.

Sounds like a business anyone who can tell red ink from black would fight to avoid, doesn't it?

On the contrary. Trading in radio stations has never been more active; prices for radio stations have never been higher. Not only that, but they keep going higher every day. In 1953 J. Elroy McCaw bought New York's Station WINS from Crosley Corp. for \$450,-

000. Ten years later Westinghouse Broadcasting paid him \$10 million for it. Henry Rau bought WOL in Washington, D.C. in 1953 for \$75,000. He sold it in 1965 to Sonderling Broadcasting for \$1.25 million. Gordon McLendon paid \$525,000 for KILT in Houston in 1957, sold it 11 years later to Lin Broadcasting for \$7.25 million.

"There's a rule of thumb in this industry," says a radioman, only half jokingly, "that a station is worth ten times its earnings or 100 times its losses."

How To Keep Books. The reason is this: Those losses are often more apparent than real. Actually, radio today is a very profitable industry, despite television; and even the stations that show losses are usually making a handsome living for the men who own and operate them. It's largely a matter of book-keeping.

Specifically, it's a matter of the way the federal income-tax regulations are written. Consider, first, a radio station that makes money. The man who owns it paid \$1 million for it. Of this, \$750,000 represented the value of the equipment, the other \$250,000 "intangibles." It's now fully depreciated and shows earnings of \$350,000 before taxes, roughly \$175,000 after taxes. It can easily be sold for \$3.5 million, not ten but 20 times earnings.

Under the federal income-tax regulations, the purchaser has a variety of ways of figuring his taxes, but a commonly accepted one is this: He says the intangibles are now worth three times earnings, or \$525,000. The equipment, though fully depreciated, still is worth \$750,000. That, of course, adds up to only \$1.275 million, but this doesn't bother the purchaser, nor does it bother the Internal Revenue Service. The IRS permits the purchaser to write up the value of both the intangibles and the equipment proportionately to reach \$3.5 million. By this process, for tax purposes, the intangibles become worth roughly \$1.5 million and the equipment \$2 million.

Now assume that the purchaser depreciates the legally inflated price of his equipment over ten years and that the station still shows an operating profit of \$350,000. Under these circumstances the station will show only \$150,000 pretax and \$75,000 after taxes. But it will have "real earnings"—that is, cash flow—of \$275,000, consisting of \$200,000 depreciation and \$75,000 profit, as opposed to only \$175,000 for its previous owner who didn't have as good a tax break.

In this setting it is not hard to see that much of the trading in radio stations today—and much of the rise in station prices—stems from a kind of swapping among station owners. Two men, both with \$1 million in a station, can each sell his for \$3.5 million; and each owner, using the sample figures above, could thereby increase his annual cash flow by \$100,000. Moreover, the depreciation portion has the added advantage of not being taxable as personal income.

The federal income-tax regulations also enable a man who owns a radio station to show losses and still live in at least reasonable affluence. Consider Ralph J. Baron, who now owns three stations. Baron went into the radio business in 1960 by purchasing WILA in Danville, Va. He ran it with his wife, a sales manager and three announcers. He paid his staff \$2,000 a month. His mortgage and other expenses cost him \$2,500 a month. On his books he showed a loss. But thanks to the cash throw-off from depreciation, he was able to pay himself \$1,000 a month while getting to work upgrading Station WILA.

Specialize! This is one reason why even radio stations that appear to lose money can sell for incredible prices, "100 times losses," as the radio man said. However, there is also this fact about radio today: Even given the strange bookkeeping of the industry, even given the competition from television, the

majority of radio stations make very good money.

When television came in, everyone said that radio was through. That's what everyone said about the magazine industry too. The fact is that radio has followed exactly the same route as the magazines. Just as the general magazine is on the ropes in its competition with television, while the specialized magazine has prospered as never before, so has the radio station that attempts to appeal to everyone died, while the specialized radio station has boomed.

One of the men who realized this before the industry did generally is Erny Tannen, 46, who now owns two radio stations and has a half interest in two others. Tannen bought his first, WDMV in the Delmarva Peninsula, which lies in Delaware, Maryland and Virginia, for \$100,000 in 1960. WDMV was losing money, not merely on the books but in fact. Tannen decided that, with specialized programming, it could become a money-maker. Eighty percent of the peninsula's economy consists of agriculture. Explains Tannen: "The farmers listened to their transistors in the barn, on the tractor and in the fields. We simply introduced programming they could identify with. We interviewed them. We were the official radio of every farm event. We attended all their meetings. And we reported all the farm news." Tannen's formula doubled WDMV's total billings in a little over three years.

When Tannen and a partner purchased another station, WYRE in Annapolis, Maryland, he again examined the area's economy, found it to be strong on pleasure boating. "So we became known as the marine weather station as well as the official radio of the Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club Association," he says.

As a result Tannen was able to add to the previous local advertisers on the station outsiders whose interest was in Tannen's boating market. Using this strategy he signed beer, marine engine, and boat insurance companies. And also as a result, he says that he has been offered \$500,000 for the station which he purchased for \$120,000 only five years ago.

Tannen's strategy has been repeated by many other owners in the last ten years. Often called "the magazine concept," its key is to analyze an area, then build specialized programming to reach the market. "I never buy stations," says Tannen, "only markets."

All over the country young entrepreneurs like Tannen are focusing the attention of their stations on their prime hours—early morning and early evening—and on auto drivers and owners of portable radios. In the larger markets they are selecting particular segments of the market. Today, for example, among New York's 34 AM and FM stations, there are three Spanish-language stations, two all-news stations, numerous "talk" stations, at least six separate varieties of music stations, and two stations aimed at Negro audiences.

Even in small markets like 46,000-population Danville, Va., specialization has paid off. When Ralph Baron bought WILA, a sunrise-to-sunset station, in 1960, it was competing directly with three other stations and floundering. Baron responded by switching its programming to what the industry calls "the ethnic format" beamed at Danville's Negroes, who comprised one-third of the population. "We convinced the merchants that WILA was in the advertising business and that we were reaching an audience they couldn't reach on the other stations," says Baron.

Today WILA advertising, which sells for \$4 per minute, is booked to the limit (18 minutes per hour) during four months of the year. In the remaining months it is about 70% sold. WILA now has a staff of 12 and the station is paid for. Expenses run about \$9,000 a month, and it makes over \$60,000 a year. Baron, who paid \$85,000 for

the station, says he recently turned down an offer for \$350,000.

While the effort to win people back to their radios has proceeded locally, it has resulted in some impressive national statistics. For example, in 1967 an estimated 47 million radios were sold, bringing the total number in operation to over 250 million. A RADAR study found that more people listen to a radio sometime during the week than turn on a television set.

Fighting TV. This specialization has not only captured radio's new audience but, just as important, it has fragmented radio audiences into age, sex, income and interest groups that are critical in selling advertising in competition with television. "With radio," says Miles David, president of the Radio Advertising Bureau, "the advertiser can pinpoint his audience much more than on television. This is one of the things the big national advertiser is looking for." David points out that companies like General Foods, Bristol-Myers, American Cyanamid and Mobil Oil all more than doubled their radio expenditures in the first nine months of 1967. Bristol-Myers, for example, increased its expenditures from \$579,000 to \$2.1 million.

With advertising revenues of \$1.8 billion, the television industry has a commanding lead on radio, with only \$912 million. Yet some of radio's gains are undoubtedly coming at the expense of television. In 1966, for example, total radio advertising income was up 10% as compared with 9% for television. In 1967, a bad year for advertising, radio was up about 3% while television held almost even. One result of this increased advertising is that, according to FCC figures, pretax radio income was up 24% in 1966, compared to only a 10% increase for television.

If radio is doing well now, the future looks just as bright. In the East, since almost all frequencies are already assigned, entry is limited and current owners are protected. Added to the promising outlook is the fact that stations are cheap to operate and costs are easy to hold in line as listenership grows. "This is a fixed-overhead business," says Ralph W. Beaudin, group vice president for radio at American Broadcasting Corp.

Yet the broadcaster who pursues aggressive growth in radio faces one obstacle: the FCC limitation on the number of stations one company may own to seven AM and seven FM. This restriction results in the "trading up" phenomenon where the big group broadcasters like Cox Broadcasting, Metromedia, Taft Broadcasting and Storer Broadcasting, all of whose sales are over \$30 million, expand by selling their smaller stations and buying bigger ones. It also means that the bigger group broadcasters are normally heavily in television (where the limit is five VHF and two UHF stations) and in many cases have diversified out of radio and television.

One such company, Capitol Cities Broadcasting, which presently owns five television stations as well as seven AM and five FM radio stations, came close to skipping radio entirely. "We were like many other people during the Fifties," says President Thomas S. Murphy. "We were preoccupied with television. But we picked up a radio station in Providence along with a television station we were after, and finally we decided to go into the radio business seriously."

Unlike many operators, Capitol Cities has concentrated on making profitable stations more profitable by beefing up ad sales rather than trying to cure sick operations. That is perhaps just as well, for Murphy admits that Capitol Cities' first attempt at changing a station's programming ended in disaster. "It was my fault," he says. "We changed the programming of our Albany station in 1954 from a good-music format to rock-and-roll, not because we knew why we were making the change but because other people seemed to be making money with this format, so we

figured we could." The change converted a modest predepreciation profit of \$29,000 to four years of losses averaging \$52,000 per year.

Murphy says his unhappy experience in Albany is one explanation for Capitol Cities' subsequently strong record. "We hoped ourselves into that decision," he says. "We have never done that again."

His record confirms it: Capitol Cities paid about \$250,000 for the Albany station in 1954. Now it is easily worth \$2 million.

Not bad for an industry that was once presumed dead.

Statutory Limitations on Spending

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that whatever spending reductions the Congress imposes be required ones, not just left to the tender dispensation of the executive branch. There is no sense in passing a surtax if it is to be used to finance additional Government spending. It is the obligation of the Congress acting through its Committees on Appropriations, to see that this does not happen.

Just how much of a reduction can be forced by statute without upsetting the economy, reversewise, is a difficult problem. But again and again the experts—of whom William McChesney Martin is certainly the expert's expert—warn that unless firm action is taken now to apply the brakes, runaway inflation can become unmanageable. Financial mismanagement in a time of fiscal crisis resulting from years of dancing without paying the fiddler is inexcusable. The American people are beginning to realize that fiscal responsibility is a necessary qualification for public service.

In this connection the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 22, 1968, is important reading:

FOOL'S PARADISE

There is the bitter old joke about premature anti-fascists—they perceived the menace so far in advance that nobody remembered their warnings when the danger became generally obvious. Some of us may perhaps be forgiven if, a little wearily, we feel the same way about inflation.

Certainly one premature anti-inflationist is William McChesney Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. For years he has been trying to tell the nation that the danger signals were flying; on one specific occasion he cited ominous parallels with the crash year of 1929. This past weekend he put it even more strongly.

"The nation is in the midst of the worst financial crisis since 1931," he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors assembled in Washington for their annual convention. "In 1931 the problem was deflation. Today it is inflation and equally intolerable."

"Intolerable" occurred in the chairman's remarks. The domestic Federal budget deficit, reckoned now at about \$20 billion for the next fiscal year, is intolerable. The same term he applied to the chronic U.S. international payments deficit, which in large part results from the domestic inflation. "Both have to be corrected over the next few years or the U.S. is going to face either an uncontrollable recession or an uncontrollable inflation."

In a word, potential disaster pretty much sums up his message.

Such candor on the part of a high Government official, especially in a time when candor seems to have gone out of style, cannot be too highly commended, and we hereby applaud it. But wait a moment; where was Mr. Martin's Fed all these years when these intolerable risks were being manufactured? Had Federal Reserve policy nothing to do with the case?

Of course it had. Mr. Martin himself concedes that the expansion of the money supply in many recent months has been excessive. His voice of dissent, however, has been a lonely one. Although chairman, he can't dictate the board's policy. Moreover, any realistic chairman must have some kind of accommodation with the White House which has been bent on wild Federal spending and deficitting, at the same time hoping to maintain an artificially easy money policy. Nor has Congress been effective in checking the Administration's omnivorous spending appetites.

So the buildup of the dangers, despite the repeated cautions of Mr. Martin and of some old-fashioned types like us, is understandable if hardly edifying. The peril being now bluntly stated, what of the remedies?

Mr. Martin favors the current bill in Congress calling for a reduction in Federal spending of \$6 billion plus the Administration's long-proposed 10% tax surcharge. We would be the first to agree that, theoretically, something of the sort is indicated by the seriousness of the Government's financial condition. As Mr. Martin says, even so rich a nation must pay its bills. Yet questions persist.

For one, a \$6 billion reduction is far too little out of the spending program originally blueprinted for fiscal 1969 at more than \$186 billion. Given the criticality of the situation, drastic slashes, particularly in non-defense spending are needed. Second, who can really believe that this spending-prone Administration would actually follow through with even a \$6 billion reduction?

Just as an example, there are such things as so-called supplemental appropriations, which the Administration sends to Congress and Congress, confronted with more or less of a fait accompli, can hardly refuse. This is one of the gimmicks that tend to make the budget, when the fiscal year is finally done, come out so much bigger than the original forecast.

The same kind of credibility gap engulfs the proposed tax increase. How could it turn out to be anti-inflationary if the Administration simply uses the added revenue to augment its spending? And why should the beleaguered taxpayer be forced to pay still more for the Government's financial mismanagement?

Federal mismanagement is the crux of the matter; in Mr. Martin's phrase, the nation—or at any rate the Government—has been living in a fool's paradise. It is late to be waking up, and we hope his vigorous lecture will wake up officials in both the Administration and Congress. But let no one confuse the issue: It is there in Washington, not in the private economic affairs of the ordinary citizen, that the cause and the cure of the terrible trouble lie.

Zambia: The African Terrorist State

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, day by day it becomes more apparent to the Ameri-

can people that what is billed by the Communists as racism is really freedom of the individual.

The leading Red-controlled organ in the United States—the U.N.—continues its sinful propaganda against Rhodesia as being racist. Yet, the same destroyer of free men is silent on antifree enterprise by seizure of all industrial and commercial enterprises by the Red puppet chief Kaunda of Zambia.

In fact, the U.N. just recently tried to launch an unsuccessful aggression against South West Africa from Zambia, but Chief Kaunda did not trust the U.N. team with one of his airplanes. He was afraid it would get lost to the South Africans.

This is the Zambia the Vice President praises—this is the Kaunda Mr. HUMPHREY lauded as the great African leader.

This is the Zambia of war lord Kaunda who is scheduled to receive 15 million in U.S. tax dollars to build a highway.

Kaunda has established a rather high protective tariff to protect his people and I call on the President of the United States and all lesser lights not to let one copper penny of U.S. money go to Zambia until he releases all seized industries and pays indemnity to the owners and operators. Until then, I call for U.S.-free world economic sanctions against Zambia.

Mr. Speaker, our State Department and leadership cannot make this many honest mistakes unintentionally.

I include the AP report of April 19, the U.N. report of April 21, and other clippings at this point:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 19, 1968]

ZAMBIA SEIZES 25 BUSINESSES

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA.—President Kenneth Kaunda announced today that the Zambian government is taking over 25 major industrial and commercial enterprises, ranging from retail chain stores to big transport corporations.

Among these is a logging company owned by the Anglo-American Corp., the giant copper mining group.

Kaunda told a cheering crowd at Kabwe he was "asking" the companies to sell 51 percent of their stock to the government. He made clear he does not anticipate anyone's refusing.

The move staggered the country's businessmen. Kaunda said it is part of a general plan to eliminate "exploitation by foreign capitalists."

OTHER CURBS

Kaunda also announced restrictions on loans to local businesses owned by expatriates, a ban on expatriate businesses outside 10 major towns and a ruling that government contracts for less than \$140,000 are to be awarded only to Zambian enterprises.

However, he said "foreign investors and foreign businessmen," in contrast to resident expatriate businessmen, are welcome in Zambia.

"It is my intention," he declared, "to enact legislation safeguarding approved foreign investments. This act will guarantee that dividends and interest payments on foreign capital may be remitted abroad, and that repatriation of capital brought in from abroad will be allowed."

COMPENSATION PLEDGED

Kaunda also pledged that compensation for government takeovers would be "fair."

He objected to local businesses owned by resident expatriates because he said they brought no capital into the country and took

capital out when the expatriates returned to their homelands.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., April 21, 1968]

DIPLOMATIC DEADLOCK OVER RHODESIA (By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The problem of racism in Rhodesia continues to bedevil chancelleries in much of the world. It torments the Commonwealth, stirs black Africa, and mocks hope for development of world order.

Well over two years ago, a small band of white Rhodesians, some five percent of the country's population, set out to defy the conscience and the organized economic power of the rest of the world. They have very largely succeeded.

UN diplomats are currently wrestling once again with ways to deal more effectively with the challenge. It is widely agreed that economic sanctions, now selective, should be made total, and that they should continue to be legally compulsory.

But suppose this is done—on paper. What then?

DISCREDIT U.N. FURTHER

South Africa and Portugal, which control key ports of entry and exit for Rhodesian supplies, have made perfectly clear they will continue to disregard UN directives. Zambia, which also has substantial Rhodesian trade, cannot obey these directives for long, and survive.

The result is that Rhodesia almost certainly will continue to fend off decisive damage. And the net effect of the crackdown will be to discredit still further the United Nations and the instrument on which it had hoped to rely in seeking peaceful change.

What to do?

Blockade the Portuguese colonial port of Lourenco Marques, Mozambique, through which a large part of the supplies flow?

There would be precedent for such action. Mozambique's other principal port, Beira, has been patrolled by British gunboats for two years to keep out oil tankers which had been feeding a Rhodesian pipeline.

But to shut both of Mozambique's ports completely, or subject them to an imposed rationing program, would be virtually an act of war against Portugal, Britain's oldest ally. The least it would be likely to do would be to drive Portugal out of NATO.

Send aircraft carriers to bomb the rail lines which carry supplies between Mozambi-

que and Rhodesia? Again a drastic step which would not help retain a Portuguese ally.

Close the South African loophole through which Rhodesia gets oil and other supplies? Far easier said than done.

South Africa has aircraft and naval vessels with which to challenge anything but a massive blockade. And in any event, neither Washington nor London would remotely consider a full-scale showdown with Pretoria at this stage.

Dry up Rhodesia's ultimate markets and sources of supply? This has been tried for two and one-half years, without notable success.

Send a British expeditionary force into Rhodesia? British opinion is deeply divided on the issue, and the Wilson government seems firmly opposed.

RHODESIA'S POSITION

Meanwhile hope of a mutually acceptable negotiated solution has all but vanished.

A Constitutional Commission in Rhodesia made clear once again this month that the only "compromise" the white minority will consider is one in which it is guaranteed permanent control.

The blacks could have a somewhat more influential political role, the Commission suggested, if they would give up any idea of ever ruling the country. But this a 95 percent majority is scarcely likely to do, and the rest of the world will not ask it to.

This is the kind of deadlock which drives men to violence.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 14, 1968]

NEW U.S. STEPS AGAINST RHODESIA ARE UNDER STUDY

The United States is "quite prepared to consider further measures" against Rhodesia, which already is subject to sanctions, Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Palmer III said yesterday.

Palmer, who last week completed his second year as assistant secretary for African affairs, noted in an interview that further sanctions are under consideration by U.N. members in New York. On the U.S. position, he emphasized that careful consideration must be given not only to the scope of any further measures but also to their probable effectiveness.

U. S. officials estimate it will be at least two weeks before a U.N. Security Council vote is taken on measures against Rhodesia, which

unilaterally declared its independence from Britain on Nov. 11, 1965.

Palmer also expressed concern over an apparent "hardening of attitude" by South Africa, which he said was indicated by its attitude toward South West Africa, the terrorist trials and its noncooperation on sanctions against Rhodesia.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 19, 1968]

SIERRA LEONE COUP DETAILS REVEALED

FREETOWN, SIERRA LEONE.—First details of a coup by a group of army noncommissioned officers in this small West African state came this morning in a broadcast by someone who identified himself only as "Sergeant Major Rogers."

Sierra Leone had been cut off from the outside world since yesterday as reports from neighboring countries said the military regime of the National Reformation Council, headed by Brig. Andrew T. Juxon-Smith, had been ousted.

This morning's broadcast said Juxon-Smith had been arrested and a new 14-man council set up under the chairmanship of Warrant Officer Patrick Conteh. Sgt. Maj. Rogers said all diplomatic missions should carry on as normal and "have no fear."

Deputy Chairman William Leigh of the council and other senior army and police officers had also been arrested, Rogers said, accusing council members of having practiced "nepotism and corruption" since taking over 14 months ago.

"Our immediate aim is to return to civilian rule," he declared, adding that the Council has been dissolved.

The new regime, styled the "Anticorruption Revolutionary Movement," announced last night formation of a seven-man national interim council of four army and three police officers whose primary task would be to work out a peaceful return to civilian rule within the "shortest possible time."

The movement also announced the recall of Col. John Bangura, currently counselor in the Sierra Leone Embassy in Washington, and Lt. Col. Ambrose Genda, ambassador to Liberia, to serve as military commanders.

About 40 senior army and police officers have been arrested and a dusk-to-dawn curfew is in force, although conditions were reported almost back to normal today.

Despite official announcements that the coup was bloodless, at least two persons were reported killed and about six wounded.

SENATE—Tuesday, April 23, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Bernie Smith, D.D., minister of the Fellowship Chapel, Hamilton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, hear our prayer. In a world that is divided and appalling, we are united and appealing unto Thee. Grant Thy favor to these who assume a vital role in the healing of a wounded world.

We thank Thee for our flag with the 50 stars of hope that shine in its firmament, and we know that every star proclaims our faith in Jehovah who guides the destiny of our people.

In an hour that recites the alphabet of death—teach us the language of life.

In an hour that invites compromise—teach us that life must be governed by principle and not by policy.

CXIV—647—Part 8

In an hour that is filled with the love of power—teach us the power of love.

In an hour when there are those who would offer men the glass crutch of bondage—teach us that we must give ourselves on the altar of service that men may learn the right and restraint of liberty.

In an hour when trouble spots like measles break out on every hand, and the dreadful cancer of division is eating at the vitals of an uncertain generation—teach us that time hastens without consent and must not leave us emptyhanded. Yea, help us to rebuild our spiritual arsenal and learn the value of the weapons of prayer and faith.

Take all that we are and all that we may yet become and use us in some measure that there will yet come a day when there is peace on earth and good will among men.

We ask not that our epitaph shall declare that we were great—but may it say that we have served.

Guide Thou the ship of state, O God. We fear not the angry waves when Thou art at the helm. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 22, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.